

SCIENTIFIC COMMUNISM

and
Its
Modern
Falsifiers

SCIENTIFIC COMMUNISM

and
Its
Modern
Falsifiers

Novosti Press Agency Publishing House
Moscow, 1975

st
e
n
e
st
n
g
l
e
n
f

This book was prepared by a group of research workers at the Institute of Marxism-Leninism under the CPSU Central Committee.

General Editor: Academician P. Fedoseyev

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	3
I. The Leading Role of the Working Class in the World Revolutionary Process and Revisionist Fabrications	14
II. Social Relations Under Socialism and Revisionist Falsifications	93
III. Revisionist Distortions of the Leninist Teaching on the Party	148
Conclusion	180

Introduction

In its worldwide class struggle against the socialist countries and the peoples that have either thrown off the yoke of oppression or are in the process of doing so, the imperialist bourgeoisie is making every effort to undermine the socialist community and the international Communist movement from within, to weaken and split the socialist countries and discredit the socialist system and Marxism-Leninism in the eyes of the working people. One of the main objectives of imperialism's anti-communist strategy is to corrupt the Communist movement and the revolutionary movement as a whole. For this, the imperialists pin high hopes on the subversive, divisive activities of the revisionists.

Marxism-Leninism is opposed by various unstable elements in Communist parties who have demonstrated their inability to make an objective, scientific assessment of the complex social problems of modern times and have betrayed their revolutionary cause. With the intensification of the battle being fought between the working class and the monopolies, between socialism and capitalism, these elements, as a result of their ideological

instability, have gone over to the side of the bourgeoisie.

Milovan Djilas, Roger Garaudy, Franz Marek, Ernst Fischer, Teodoro Petkoff, Ota Šik and other revisionist traitors to the revolutionary cause of the working class have been expelled from their respective Communist parties. From outside the Communist movement, they are now trying to provide "theoretical" reasons to justify themselves. Distorting the ideas of Marx, Engels and Lenin, and tailoring them to suit their own "theoretical concepts", these revisionists present what they call their "creative approach" as a further development of Marxist-Leninist theory, and in doing so slander real socialism and the whole international Communist movement.

Publishers in the West have lost no time in producing large editions of the "theoretical" works written by deserters from the Communist cause (Garaudy's "For a French Model of Socialism", "The Turning-Point of Socialism", "The Whole Truth", "Revival of the Hope", "The Alternative", etc.; Djilas' "The New Class. An Analysis of the Communist System"; Petkoff's "Czechoslovakia. Socialism as a Problem" and "Socialism for Venezuela?"; Fischer's "What Marx Really Said", "Recollections and Reflections", "The Revolution Is Something Different", etc.; Fischer's and Marek's "What Lenin Really Said")¹. These

¹ Roger Garaudy, *Pour un modèle français du socialisme*, Gallimard, 1968; Roger Garaudy, *Le grand tournant du socialisme*, Gallimard, 1969 (*The Turning-Point of Socialism*, London, 1970); Roger Garaudy, *Toute la vérité*, Mai 1968-Février 1970, Paris, Editions Bernard Grasset, 1970 (*The Whole Truth*, London, 1971); Roger Garaudy, *Reconquête de l'espoir*, Paris, Editions Bernard Grasset, 1971; Roger Garaudy, *L'Alternative*, Paris, 1972; Milovan Djilas, *The New*

renegades supply many articles and give numerous interviews to mass-circulation periodicals of the capitalist West. They can also be heard on the radio and seen on television offering up their revisionist wares.

An analysis of the views and concepts of these revisionists shows that they have cast in their lot with the bourgeoisie ideologically, and that they take an anti-communist and anti-Soviet stand on the basic issues. As members of Communist parties, reputed "theoreticians" and "ideologists", they began by revising individual Marxist propositions, and ended by taking the road of open betrayal. They have renounced the fundamental principles of the revolutionary teaching of the working class and replaced them with bourgeois and petty-bourgeois principles. Their views represent an eclectic, contradictory mixture of different schools and trends of bourgeois ideas, and revisionist concepts ranging from the Right to the ultra "Left". Seeking to be "fashionable" and "original", Garaudy, Marek, etc., call for "enriching" and "supplementing" the Marxist philosophy, for making it more "many-sided", "pluralistic". Erasing the lines that separate Marxism from idealism, atheism from religion, that distinguish scientific socialism from the varieties of contemporary pet-

Class. An Analysis of the Communist System, London, 1958; Ernst Fischer, *Was Marx wirklich sagte. Unter Mitarbeit von Franz Marek*, Wien u.a., Molden, 1968; Ernst Fischer, Franz Marek, *Was Lenin wirklich sagte*, Wien-Münschen-Zürich, Molden, 1969; Ernst Fischer, *Erinnerungen und Reflexionen*, Rowohlt, 1970; Ernst Fischer, *Die Revolution ist anders. Ernst Fischer stellt sich zehn Fragen kritischer Schüler*, Rowohlt, 1971; T. Petkoff, *Czechoslovakia. El socialismo como problema*, Caracas, 1969; T. Petkoff, *El socialismo para Venezuela?* Caracas, 1970.

ty-bourgeois utopian socialism, they have departed from the principle of partisanship in philosophy.

Like the bourgeois "Marxologists", the revisionists oppose Marx to Engels and Lenin to Marx and Engels and hold forth on the "obsolescence" of Marxism and the "anti-humanism" of Marxism-Leninism. Echoing the bourgeois-reformist ideologists, they contend that the working class is not fulfilling its historical mission, that the contemporary scientific and technological revolution annuls the laws of social development discovered by Marx. They declare that they have their "own" views on Lenin's theoretical legacy. Unlike the Marxists, who believe that this legacy expresses the essential requirements of today and regard it as the Marxism of the contemporary epoch, the revisionists try to depict Leninism as a nationally restricted, purely Russian phenomenon of no international importance. Thus, in this respect, too, their position fully coincides with that of bourgeois ideologists.

The revisionists claim that socialism in the Soviet Union and in other socialist countries is a far cry from Marxist theory and call for a new "model" of socialism, complete with bourgeois "democracy" and "freedom". They falsify the results and prospects of the contemporary revolutionary struggle, distort the Marxist-Leninist theory on the driving forces of the revolution, deny the Communist Party's leading role in the struggle for socialism, and try to capitalise on the difficulties facing the world Communist movement.

Revisionism is the replacement of Marxism-Leninism with old and present-day versions of bourgeois and petty-bourgeois concepts. Lenin characterised Right revisionism as "petty-bourgeois reformism, i. e., servility to the bourgeoisie co-

vered by a cloak of sentimental democratic and 'Social'-Democratic phrases and fatuous wishes".¹ And whatever the revisionists may say about their intentions, their objective role is determined by the content and conditions of the class struggle between socialism and capitalism and by the side they take in this struggle. Lenin said: "It is not a matter of intentions, motives or words but of the objective situation, independent of them, that determines the fate and significance of slogans, of tactics or, in general, of the trend of a given party or group."²

In Djilas, Garaudy, Fischer, Marek, Šik and other renegades, the imperialist bourgeoisie has found accomplices whose subversive activities—practical as well as in the field of theory—render them valuable assistance. This is why the Marxist-Leninist parties regard the struggle against such elements as essential to consolidating their own ranks and promoting the growth and unity of all revolutionary forces.

In the history of the working class and Communist movements attempts to falsify Marxism-Leninism are nothing new. The struggle against revisionists and apostates is a long one. One has only to recall such revisionists as Bernstein, Kautsky and others whose efforts ended in political fiasco. Marxism-Leninism gives a clear-cut definition of revisionism. Lenin pointed out, "In the sphere of politics, revisionism did really try to revise the foundation of Marxism, namely, the doctrine of the class struggle. Political freedom, democracy and universal suffrage remove the

¹ Lenin, *Coll. Works*, Vol. 33, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1966, p. 21.

² *Ibid.*, Vol. 19, p. 262.

ground for the class struggle—we were told... To determine its conduct from case to case, to adapt itself to the events of the day and to the chopping and changing of petty politics, to forget the primary interests of the proletariat and the basic features of the whole capitalist system, of all capitalist evolution, to sacrifice these primary interests for the real or assumed advantages of the moment—such is the policy of revisionism.”¹

It is in this way that Communists assess revisionism.

Lenin saw the objective social sources of revisionism first of all in the existence of the petty-bourgeoisie, the pressure of the bourgeois and petty-bourgeois ideology on the working class, and in certain features of the workers' movement itself. The petty-bourgeoisie, Lenin pointed out, “surround the proletariat on every side with a petty-bourgeois atmosphere, which permeates and corrupts the proletariat, and constantly causes among the proletariat relapses into petty-bourgeois spinelessness, disunity, individualism, and alternating moods of exaltation and dejection.”²

Over recent years, in connection with the process of the further monopolisation of the capitalist economy and the specific nature of the scientific and technological revolution in the West, the ranks of the working class have been joined by many members of the petty bourgeoisie ruined by big business. Millions of new people belonging to different social strata are being drawn into becoming politically active. Many of them have a large stock of revolutionary energy, but at the same time only vague notions about the ways of sol-

¹ Lenin, *Coll. Works*, Vol. 15, pp. 36, 37-38.

² *Ibid.*, Vol. 31, p. 44.

ving the problems facing them. The section of the working class that is petty-bourgeois in its origin and views forms the social basis of opportunism. "...The growth of the workers' party often attracts many opportunists to its ranks," Lenin wrote. "...In our day socialists of bourgeois origin most often bring to the proletariat their timidity, narrow-mindedness and love of phrase-mongering rather than firmness of revolutionary convictions."¹

Lenin called special attention of the revolutionaries to the ideological influence of the bourgeoisie on the proletariat, to the fact that the zigzags of bourgeois tactics resulted in a rise of revisionism in the working-class movement, and noted that by means of a "more cunning", "liberal" policy the bourgeoisie succeeds in attaining its ends for a certain time, that is, in deceiving some of the working-class movement with what appear to be concessions, and that then "the revisionists declare that the doctrine of the class struggle is 'antiquated', or begin to conduct a policy which is in fact a renunciation of the class struggle."²

The present-day revisionists of Marxism who talk so much of their commitment to "freedom" and "democracy" are, in fact, working in the interests of the bourgeoisie. Hence the prominence given to them by the "free" and "democratic" bourgeois press and other mass media belonging to monopoly capital. The revisionists take great pains to try and persuade their readers that conditions have "radically changed", and that the cause of the working class is dear to them. But

¹ Lenin, *Coll. Works*, Vol. 17, p. 94.

² *Ibid.*, Vol. 16, p. 351.

as August Bebel once said, you must have done something very stupid when you are praised by the enemies of the working class.

The Communist and workers' parties are waging an uncompromising ideological and political struggle on two fronts—against Right and “Left” opportunism and revisionism within the revolutionary movement. Right opportunism seeks to emasculate the Marxist-Leninist teaching by robbing it of its revolutionary essence and replacing it with bourgeois reformism. Revisionism always signifies political capitulation in the face of difficulties, capitulation to the class enemy. It means the abandonment of the proletarian position and the replacement of Marxism with bourgeois and petty-bourgeois concepts. “Left” revisionism seeks to supplant the scientifically-based Marxist theory on which the revolutionary movement is built, with political adventurism; it ignores the real conditions under which the class struggle proceeds. Petty-bourgeois “ultra-revolutionism” is fatal to the revolutionary movement.

A special feature of the ideological struggle at the present stage is that Right and “Left” opportunism often merges with nationalism and with the most rabid and reactionary anti-communism and anti-Sovietism. Presenting the Central Committee's report to the 24th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, Leonid Brezhnev said: “The fight against Right and ‘Left’ revisionism and against nationalism continues to be a matter of vital concern. It is precisely nationalistic tendencies, especially those which assume the form of anti-Sovietism, that the theorists of capitalism and capitalist propaganda have placed most reliance on in their fight against socialism and the Communist movement.”

Maoism is especially dangerous among the trends hostile to Marxism-Leninism. As an ideological and political trend Maoism is a combination of various petty-bourgeois nationalistic concepts and actions in which ultra-revolutionary phrases are used to conceal an ultra-reactionary essence.

The Maoists' hostility to Marxism-Leninism, to the Communist cause, is characterised by a disregard for the objective laws of social development, claims to national exclusiveness, a striving for hegemonism in the international working-class, Communist and national liberation movements, rejection of the leading role of the working class in the revolutionary struggle, distortion of the Marxist-Leninist teaching on the Communist Party and the class essence of the dictatorship of the proletariat, and a negation of the principles of proletarian internationalism and adoption of positions of nationalism and anti-Sovietism.

Great-power chauvinism, subjectivism and voluntarism in the internal and foreign-policy of the Chinese leadership result in the deformation of the socialist system and lead the Maoists to adventurist practices, the preachment of sectarianism and putschism in the revolutionary movement, and to divisive and subversive activity against the socialist countries and the anti-imperialist movement.

Acting in the interests of the military-bureaucratic state leadership of present-day China, the Maoists are betraying the Chinese revolution, in the name of which the Chinese people have accepted great sacrifices. In urging the peoples of the newly free countries to copy their "model of socialism", the Maoists are trying to induce these countries to take a path that is fraught with economic disruptions and political despotism. Waging

a propaganda war against the USSR and other socialist countries, slandering the Party, the country of Lenin, and the Soviet people, the Maoists are assisting the most reactionary forces of world imperialism and fascism, and hampering progress towards peace and social justice. The chauvinistic and anti-Soviet policy pursued by the present Peking leaders is adversely affecting the entire international atmosphere. Their dangerous course aimed against detente, and at undermining world socialism, is against the interests of all peoples. While parading under communist slogans, they have in reality gone over to the camp of anti-communism and are discrediting scientific communism.

The policy of the Maoists is being increasingly condemned by all those who cherish the cause of peace and socialism. The Marxist-Leninist parties resolutely oppose Maoism as the main anti-Marxist nationalist danger to the revolutionary movement. Exposure of the anti-Leninist chauvinistic ideology and policy of Maoism contributes to the strengthening of the unity of world socialism, the international Communist and the working-class movement and the entire anti-imperialist movement. The achievements of the socialist countries in the building of the new society, and the pursuit by them of a co-ordinated foreign policy that limits the Maoists' divisive activity and neutralises many of its negative consequences, convincingly demonstrate the force and advantages of scientific communism and a consistently Marxist-Leninist policy. Whatever its form, revisionism in the field of theory paves the way for opportunist practice; revisionism seeks to penetrate Communist and workers' parties and put its stamp on them, preventing Communists from making full and effective

use of all the possibilities of revolutionary struggle. Marxist-Leninist parties must therefore firmly rebuff opportunism of every type and form.

The present work deals with some of the Right-revisionist concepts that are being widely publicised by the mass media in the "Free World". It examines what the revisionists have to say concerning three key aspects of the theory of scientific communism: the nature of the driving forces behind the present-day revolutionary process and the essence of this process; the development of real socialism; and the role of the Marxist-Leninist parties in social development.

I. The Leading Role of the Working Class in the World Revolutionary Process and Revisionist Fabrications

Modern times have seen a steady growth of the world-historical role of the working class as the vanguard of all revolutionary forces supporting socialism, democracy and peace, and opposing imperialism, reaction and war. Present-day social changes in the capitalist world have brought the working people face to face with imperialism. Non-proletarian sections of society are becoming more and more aware of the need to take joint action with the working class, which heads the anti-imperialist struggle. Experience has shown that all the anti-imperialist forces must be united. The workers, the most organised and numerically the strongest class, have gained a wealth of revolutionary experience. Their political understanding continues to grow and their general cultural level to rise, and their political and moral authority in society has increased immensely. It is therefore particularly important to prevent the Marxist-Leninist doctrine on the great historical mission that the workers have to perform from being distorted by revisionist and reformist concepts.

The revisionists try to conceal their anti-proletarian position by referring to "new objective con-

ditions" in the world. Garaudy, for instance, claims that world social development in the latter half of the 20th century is determined by the scientific and technological revolution and not by the struggle between socialism and capitalism. This idea he has borrowed directly from "fashionable" bourgeois theories which absolutise the role of the scientific and technological revolution and give a technocratic interpretation of its social consequences. Garaudy links social progress only with the development of the productive forces, ignoring the part played by the production relations and the class struggle, and virtually denies the need for a socialist revolution. He thus takes the stand of technocratic reformism.¹

Garaudy declares that the class structure of capitalist society has undergone radical changes as a result of the scientific and technological revolution. He calls these changes "mutations", and attacks those Communist parties which allegedly take no account of them.²

According to Garaudy, the essence of these radical changes is that the working class has lost the objective position of being the main opponent of monopoly capital and the decisive force for social progress. He claims that since the intelligentsia and its role have been growing during the scien-

¹ Garaudy himself says that his concept is "far from being a technocratic variation of traditional reformism" (*Le grand tournant*, p. 12). The best reply to this is the following quotation from Lenin: "We judge a person not by what he says or thinks of himself but by his actions. And we must judge philosophers not by the labels they give themselves... but by how they actually settle fundamental theoretical questions, by their associates, by what they are teaching and by what they have taught their disciples and followers" (Lenin, *Coll. Works*, Vol. 14, pp. 217-218).

² *Pour un modèle français du socialisme*, p. 23.

tific and technological revolution, it is the intelligentsia that is now playing the key role in social development, that it is the scientific and technical intelligentsia, primarily the scientists, who now represent the decisive force for transforming the world.¹

Not daring to openly deny the historical role of the working class for fear of revealing his abandonment of Marxism, Garaudy revises the Marxist-Leninist doctrine on this question in a veiled form. While he does not assert openly that the intelligentsia has *replaced* the working class as the key social force, he does argue that it plays the key role as a force which forms a *part* of either the working class or of what he calls a "new historical bloc".

He writes that "in our epoch, the concept 'working class' extends to the new life-giving forces of a nation, especially those strata of the intelligentsia which arise and evolve organically as a result of scientific, technological and economic development".²

More specifically, he says that engineers, technicians, administrators and scientists are becoming an integral part of the working class.³ He regards the working class as an entity comprising persons engaged in physical and intellectual work, a class including both white-collar and blue-collar workers, and contends that the new class affiliation of some categories of the intelligentsia stems from the scientific and technological revolution.⁴ Moreover he stresses that intellectual workers are one

¹ *Le grand tournant du socialisme*, p. 310.

² *Pour un modèle français du socialisme*, p. 22.

³ *Toute la vérité*, p. 97.

⁴ *Le grand tournant du socialisme*, p. 243.

of the most promising sections of the working class.

Ernst Fischer takes a similar stand. He holds that in industrialised countries the greater part of the intelligentsia now "objectively belongs to the working class",¹ that the intelligentsia has "largely been integrated with the modern working class",² and that the "technical intelligentsia is merging with the working class".³

Despite external differences, this concept virtually falls into line with the assertions of sociologists of the capitalist world concerning an alleged "erosion" of the working class, or dissolving of it, together with the intelligentsia and white-collar workers, into some "middle class". It leads to erasing the social boundaries of the working class and to denying the specificity of its role and class interests.

Garaudy's and Fischer's concepts are fundamentally wrong and politically harmful, because:

(1) they minimise the leading role of the working class proper. Garaudy and Fischer do not say that this role has "shifted" directly to the scientists and engineers, as do the bourgeois sociologists who champion technocracy. What Garaudy and Fischer, more subtly, maintain is that this leading role has been taken over by these same scientists and engineers as part of the working class, and moreover, as the part of it "with the greatest future potential";

(2) they artificially "eliminate" the problem of ensuring an alliance between the working class and the scientific and technological intelligentsia, and

¹ Ernst Fischer, *Die Revolution ist anders*, S. 22.

² *Ibid.*, S. 27.

³ *Ibid.*, S. 21.

of winning the latter over to the side of the proletariat in the struggle against the monopolies; this is allegedly unnecessary since this part of the intelligentsia has already supposedly become part of the working class by "merging" with it. Ernst Fischer declares outright that "it would be wrong to speak of an 'alliance' between workers and the intelligentsia, for members of the intelligentsia who depend on salaries for their livelihood most probably belong to the contemporary working class";¹

(3) they ignore the fact that there are socially and politically different types of scientists, technologists and administrators, and that they have specific interests and demands which in no way always coincide with those of the workers, and which must be taken into account by Communists when working with them;

(4) they allege that the intelligentsia and the working class can merge already under capitalism, that the contrasting nature of and essential distinctions between intellectual and physical work can be eliminated by scientific and technological changes without a socialist revolution and without the construction of a Communist society.

Garaudy tries to validate his idea of including scientists, technologists and a section of white-collar workers in the working class, and to give it a "Marxist" guise, by the following argument. Pointing out that, as a result of the scientific and technological revolution, the importance of intellectual work is growing and the number of scientists and technologists is rapidly increasing, he reasons that if this intelligentsia is included in the

¹ *Die Revolution ist anders*, S. 32.

working class as part of it, thus widening its scope, this provides even more striking confirmation of the correctness of the Marxist proposition which names the working class as the leading and steadily growing social force.

But the Marxist doctrine on the historical mission of the working class is perfectly adequate without Garaudy's "innovatory" arguments. The working class is growing numerically not only in undeveloped and developing countries which are industrialising, but also in advanced capitalist states. It was stated at the 19th Congress of the French Communist Party that in France the working class had nine million members, and that it was still growing. In 1970, the working class accounted for 44 per cent of the gainfully employed population as against 40.3 per cent in 1954. Between 1964 and 1968, the French working class increased by one million. In the last six years the ranks of the working class in industry and the transport services have grown by 11 per cent.

In the gainfully employed population of the United States, the proportion of blue-collar (industrial) workers is decreasing slightly in comparison with non-manual workers and office employees (white-collar workers). However, between 1960 and 1970 the absolute numerical strength of the industrial working class rose by more than 4.5 million (20 per cent).

But it should be pointed out here that if we wish to discover the general direction of change in the numbers and proportion of the working class in capitalist society, it is wrong to take only one country as our standard, as Garaudy does in dealing only with the United States. The working class is playing its historical role as an international force. And this force, the international working

class, is continuing to grow. At the beginning of the century there were not more than 30 million industrial workers in the advanced capitalist countries. Now they number 90 million.

Many new occupations have come into being as a result of the establishment of new industries, the appearance of new branches of science, radical changes in old industries and the extensive introduction of automation techniques and electrical, chemical and gas technologies into production and public services. For instance, in the 25 years between 1947 and 1972, about 11,000 new professions and trades appeared in the United States

Long ago, in his work "What the 'Friends of the People' Are and How They Fight the Social-Democrats", Lenin pointed out that "it is absurd to identify the number of factory workers with the number of workers engaged in capitalist production", that in relation to the proletariat in general "the factory workers play the role only of front-rankers, the vanguard".¹

In addition to factory workers, the working class includes workers in the mining industry, in construction, and in transport, communications and other branches of the infrastructure. In these branches of the economy, too, scientific and technological progress inevitably leads to the appearance of new trades connected with the servicing of modern technology.

The working class includes agricultural workers. In the countries of developed capitalism their number is gradually decreasing, but in many agrarian countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America they constitute a growing part of the proleta-

¹ Lenin, *Coll. Works*, Vol. 1, pp. 313, 316.

riat. In the socialist countries, too, an increase may be observed in the number of workers employed on state-owned agricultural enterprises.

A large and constantly growing section of the working class is engaged in the servicing sphere, such as in public utilities, trade and public catering, etc. In step with the mechanisation of this sphere the labour of the workers engaged in it is increasingly acquiring an industrial character.

In his address to the 15th Congress of the Soviet Trade Unions, Leonid Brezhnev noted that the ranks of the international working class, the most progressive revolutionary class of the present day, and its role as the main productive and socio-political force in the world will continue to grow. Contrary to fashionable anti-Marxist theories which claim that the scientific and technological revolution is limiting the scope of and even abolishing the working class, the facts show that scientific and technological progress is leading everywhere to the growth of the working class, among other things as a result of the appearance of new trades and professions arising from modern production.

It is true that in some cases the growth of the working class in one country or another may slow down, and its size relative to the total population may even decrease as a result of a fall in employment in the sphere of production. But Marxism has never reduced the question of the role of the working class solely to its numerical strength. Lenin strongly criticised any linking of the scope of the revolutionary movement and the social role of the proletariat with the numbers of this class or the numbers of factory workers alone. He wrote: "There is, of course, no doubt that the revolutionary movement of the proletariat depends on the

number of these workers, on their concentration, on the degree of their development, etc.; but all this does not give us the slightest right to *equate the 'unifying significance' of capitalism with the number of factory workers*. To do so would be to narrow down Marx's idea impossibly." ¹

The strength of the working class Lenin viewed as lying first of all in the objective role it plays in the economic, social and political life of society, in its ability to unite around itself the broad mass of the working people, in alliance with which it comprises and will continue to comprise an absolute majority of the population.

The report of the Central Committee to the 24th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union emphasises that the place of the working class in society does not depend only on its numerical strength, which may vary in accordance with the rate of economic growth and the progress of the scientific and technological revolution. Its leading role is determined by the fact that it is the main productive force, and by its militant revolutionary qualities.

Like other falsifiers of Marxism, Garaudy distorts the character of the changes in the composition of the working class resulting from the progress of the productive forces. He tries to support his fabrications with quotations from Marx. He cites Marx's "collective labourer" as a concept that, allegedly, makes it possible to include non-manual workers and other white-collar workers in the working class.

Garaudy writes: "...In an era when, as foreseen by Marx, science is becoming a leading force in production, it is an objective fact that a growing

¹ Lenin, *Coll. Works*, Vol. 1, p. 316.

number of non-manual workers (notably engineers and research workers) are coming to form part of the 'collective labourer', and to exhibit class criteria corresponding to those applied by Marx when he defined the working class."¹ As it turns out, however, this is where Garaudy distorts Marx's actual statements and at the same time revises fundamental methodological Marxist-Leninist propositions on the role of the intelligentsia in society and on the ways and means of eliminating the antithesis and essential distinctions between mental and physical labour. Let us deal with these questions in more detail.

A careful examination of Marx's statements on the "collective labourer" shows that he used the term to define the aggregate, the sum-total of people engaged in production, for example, the entire production personnel of an enterprise working in conditions of cooperation and a technological division of labour.

It is precisely in this sense that Marx wrote about the "collective labourer" under conditions of simple cooperation² and manufacture.³ He wrote: "The collective labourer, with one set of his many hands armed with one kind of tools, draws the wire, with another set, armed with different tools, he, at the same time, straightens it, with another, he cuts it, with another, points it, and so on."⁴ Here Marx gives the term "collective labourer" an industrial-technological meaning.

As the transition to mechanised production proceeds, the cooperation of labour becomes a "tech-

¹ *Le grand tournant du socialisme*, p. 245.

² Karl Marx, *Capital*, Vol. 1, Foreign Languages Publishing House, Moscow, p. 327.

³ *Ibid.*, pp. 339, 344-345, 346, 348-349, 350, 361-362.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 344.

nical necessity dictated by the instrument of labour itself".¹ The division of labour develops and becomes more pronounced. So Marx also writes about the collective labourer in the context of the capitalist factory and identifies him with the combined working personnel.²

Analysing the work of a mechanised factory of his day, Marx defines this work as the cooperation of various categories of workers managing a system of productive machinery, and writes that, in this respect, the "collective labourer, or social body of labour, appears as the dominant subject, and the mechanical automaton as the object", and that this definition "is applicable to every possible employment of machinery on a large scale..."³

When he used the term "collective labourer" Marx certainly did not identify the collective labourer with the working class. On the contrary, he pointed out that the production staff of an enterprise thus defined was *socially heterogeneous*. Specifically, he stressed the *antithesis between mental and manual labour* that existed in the composition of the "collective labourer" under capitalism and that, in conditions of capitalist private ownership, extended also to the whole sphere of production. He wrote: "As in the natural body head and hand wait upon each other, so the labour-process unites the labour of the hand with that of the head. Later on they part company and even become deadly foes. The product ceases to be the direct product of the individual, and becomes a social product, produced in common by a collective labourer, i. e., by a combination of workmen, each of whom

¹ *Capital*, Vol. 1, p. 386.

² *Ibid.*, pp. 461-62.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 419.

takes only a part, greater or less, in the manipulation of the object of their labour. As the co-operative character of the labour-process becomes more and more marked, so, as a necessary consequence, does our notion of productive labour, and of its agent, the productive labourer, become extended. In order to labour productively, it is no longer necessary for you to do manual work yourself; enough if you are an organ of the collective labourer, and perform one of its subordinate functions.”¹

What did Marx have in mind when he wrote: “Included among these productive workers, of course, are all those who contribute in one way or another to the production of the commodity, from the actual operative to the manager or engineer (as distinct from the capitalist)”?² We must note that he makes a distinction between “the actual operative” on the one hand and the manager or engineer on the other.

In the first place, Marx regarded engineers as productive workers and even productive labourers, i. e., wage-workers, *from the standpoint of capital*.³ But he notes that from this standpoint even a clown who “works in the service of a capitalist (an entrepreneur)”, or a “writer who turns out stuff for his publisher in factory style” or a “singer commissioned by an entrepreneur to sing in order to make money for him”⁴ can be regarded as productive labourers. He says that teachers who are employed by the owner of an educational establishment and are exploited by him, and actors whose

¹ *Capital*, Vol. 1, pp. 508-509.

² Karl Marx, *Theories of Surplus-Value*, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1969, Part I, pp. 156-57.

³ *Ibid.*, pp. 411-412

⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 157, 401.

performances produce wealth for the businessmen in the arts are productive labourers in relation to their employer.¹

Secondly, Marx regarded engineers as one of the categories of labourers that could be remote from or near to production, as part of the *totality of labourers* who produce "the result, which, considered as the *result* of the labour-process pure and simple, is expressed in a *commodity* or *material product*."² This means that engineers also play a direct part in the production of commodities, i. e., the material product, and they are therefore *productive* labourers. Marx writes further on: "...and all together, as a workshop, they are the living production machine of these *products*—just as, taking the production process as a whole, they exchange their labour for capital and reproduce the capitalists' money as capital, that is to say, as value producing surplus-value, as self-expanding value."³

Thus, when treating engineers as productive labourers Marx is speaking in the abstract, deliberately disregarding the *specific* labour of engineering and technical personnel, *their place and role in the social division of labour* and in its organisation and the *cultural and technical distinctions* between this personnel and the workers, i. e., those features that socially rank engineering and technical workers among the *intelligentsia*.

Marx emphasises this abstraction when he writes that "the designation of labour as *productive labour* has absolutely nothing to do with the *determinate content* of the labour, its special utility, or

¹ *Theories of Surplus-Value*, Part 1, p. 411.

² *Ibid.*

³ *Ibid.*

the particular use-value in which it manifests itself".¹ Precisely therefore, under capitalism, the same kind of labour may be both productive (for the capitalist) and unproductive (when it does not produce surplus-value for the capitalist).²

Marx refers directly to the social heterogeneity of the people he regarded as wage-workers: "It is indeed the characteristic feature of the capitalist mode of production that it separates the various kinds of labour from each other, therefore also mental and manual labour—or kinds of labour in which one or the other predominates—and distributes them among different people. This however does not prevent the material product from being *the common product* of these persons, or their common product embodied in material wealth; any more than on the other hand it prevents or in any way alters the relation of each one of these persons to capital being that of wage-labourer and in this pre-eminent sense being that a *productive labourer*."³

This shows in what specific meaning engineering and technical workers can be regarded as productive labourers, as part of the collective labourer, how they differ socially from the working class in their work and in the role they play in the social division of labour.

Therefore, it would seem to be more correct to translate and understand the term "Arbeiter" used by Marx as "labourer" and not "worker" and hence "Gesamtarbeiter" as "collective labourer" and not "aggregate worker".

This interpretation is further confirmed in yet

¹ *Theories of Surplus-Value*, Part I, p. 401.

² *Ibid.*, pp. 401, 407-08, 409, 410, 411.

³ *Ibid.*, pp. 411-12.

another passage from *Capital*. When Marx describes the technical division of labour in a capitalist factory, he singles out such categories as machinists and their assistants, and auxiliary workers, who feed the material of labour into a machine. He then goes on: "In addition to these two principal classes, there is a numerically unimportant class of persons, whose occupation it is to look after the whole of the machinery and repair it from time to time; such as engineers, mechanics, joiners, etc. This is a superior class of workmen, some of them scientifically educated, others brought up to a trade; it is distinct from the factory operative class, and merely aggregated to it."¹

Hence, Marx *excludes* engineers and mechanics from the working class in respect of their role in the social division of labour and their educational level.

When characterising the *technological division of labour* Marx treats engineering and technical personnel as part of the collective labourer, but in examining the *social division of labour* he draws a clear line between this personnel and the workers, pointing up the antithesis between mental and manual labour under capitalism.

Marx writes that the capitalist "hands over the work of direct and constant supervision of the individual workmen, and groups of workmen, to a special kind of wage-labourer. An industrial army of workmen, under the command of a capitalist, requires, like a real army, officers (managers), and sergeants (foremen, overlookers), who, while the work is being done, command in the name of the capitalist. The work of supervision becomes their

¹ *Capital*, Vol. 1, p. 420.

established and exclusive function.”¹ Obviously, although supervisors belong to the category of *wage-workers*, they do not belong to the *working class*. Engineers and technicians who change over under present conditions from supervision of the workers to “supervision” of intricate machinery are not automatically included in the working class either.

References are sometimes made to Marx’s statement that “in the history of capitalist production, the determination of what is a working-day, presents itself as the result of a struggle, a struggle between collective capital, i. e., the class of capitalists, and collective labour, i. e., the working-class”.² But here Marx does not examine the question of the composition of the working personnel of an enterprise, that is, the collective labourer. What he has in mind is the fact that the struggle is not between an individual capitalist (or a group of capitalists) and an individual worker (or a group of workers, the workers of an individual enterprise, and so on), but between *all capitalists* (i. e., the “collective capitalist” or the capitalist class) and all workers (i. e., the “collective labourer”, or the *working class*).

Thus, thorough analysis of Marx’s actual words shows that Garaudy cannot use the authority of Marx’s works to substantiate his argument that under capitalism engineering, technical, scientific and administrative personnel belong to, and merge with, the working class.

But comparison of Garaudy’s interpretation of Marx’s statements with what Marx actually said is not the only thing that proves him wrong. Since

¹ *Capital*, Vol. 1, p. 332.

² *Ibid.*, p. 235.

Garaudy claims to be "creatively developing" Marxism over the question of the extension of the boundaries of the working class in the context of the present scientific and technological revolution, we must examine more closely the reasons why it is wrong in theory to speak of the automatic merging of engineering, technical and scientific workers with the working class under capitalism.

When Garaudy declares that "criteria of class affiliation which coincide with Marx's criteria of affiliation to the working class" can be applied to an ever growing number of employees in the capitalist countries whose work is primarily of an intellectual nature, he is not using Marxist-Leninist methods of determining the social role of this category of employees and not taking account of the conditions necessary for eliminating the antithesis and basic differences between mental and manual work.

The most comprehensive Marxist definition of the socio-economic characteristics of classes has been given by Lenin: "Classes are large groups of people differing from each other by the place they occupy in a historically determined system of social production, by their relation (in most cases fixed and formulated in law) to the means of production, by their role in the social organisation of labour, and, consequently, by the dimensions of the share of social wealth of which they dispose and the mode of acquiring it. Classes are groups of people one of which can appropriate the labour of another owing to the different places they occupy in a definite system of social economy."¹

The main class-forming characteristic is relation to the means of production, i. e., whether the given

¹ Lenin, *Coll. Works*, Vol. 29, p. 421.

class is the owner of the means of production or is deprived of them, or with what form of ownership it is directly connected. Stressing the decisive significance of this characteristic, Lenin explained that in a communist society there are no classes, that is, "there is no distinction between the members of society as regards their relation to the social means of production".¹

The place a class occupies in a definite system of social production is its place in the given system of production relations, in the given mode of production, in the given socio-economic formation. What is of decisive significance is whether it is the dominant, ruling, leading class in the social structure of society or a subordinate, oppressed and directed class. "The fundamental criterion by which classes are distinguished is the place they occupy in social production, and, consequently, the relation in which they stand to the means of production."²

The role of a class in the social organisation of labour is expressed in the functions it performs in the system of the social division and organisation of labour—whether it is engaged in material production, in the sphere of circulation, in the cultural sphere or in administration, whether it engages in industrial or agricultural labour, in executive or organising activity.

The means of obtaining income and the size of it is a derivative characteristic stemming from other features, Lenin stressed. "To look for the fundamental distinguishing feature of the various classes of society in their sources of income is to give precedence to relations of distribution, which

¹ Lenin, *Coll. Works*, Vol. 25, p. 462.

² *Ibid.*, Vol. 6, pp. 264-265.

in reality are only a consequence of relations of production. This error was long ago pointed out by Marx, who described as vulgar socialists those who failed to see it.”¹

The existence of exploiters and exploited, and the possibility of some people appropriating the labour of others was regarded by Lenin as a characteristic of classes. The division of society into classes, he wrote, is “a division into groups of people some of which were permanently in a position to appropriate the labour of others, where some people exploited others.”²

This definition of characteristics of classes is wholly applicable to societies divided into antagonistic classes, into exploiters and exploited. When applied to socialist society the definition retains its methodological significance for analysing radical changes in the social structure and the position of classes, and the prospects for the disappearance of distinctions between classes. Under socialism there is no exploitation of one class by another, for the exploiting classes have been abolished and only non-antagonistic classes of working people can exist. The radical change in the social nature of these classes of working people—their transformation into a socialist working class and a socialist class of farmers united in co-operatives—fills their distinguishing features with a qualitatively new content. There are no relations of domination and subordination between them, but the working class plays the guiding, leading role in society. They are connected with the same type of ownership—public, socialist ownership of

¹ Lenin, *Coll. Works*, Vol. 6, p. 264.

² *Ibid.*, Vol. 29, p. 475, see also Vol. 30, p. 250, and Vol. 31, p. 292.

the means of production, although existing in different forms. They perform similar functions in the sphere of social organisation of labour, although here as well the working class plays the leading role as the principal producer of material wealth and the vehicle of industrial forms of labour. The two classes obtain income in accordance with the socialist principle of distribution according to labour, although there are still differences in the forms and size of income.

Thus, under socialism classes are of the same social type, they are socially united in the main respect, are drawing ever closer together, and distinctions between them are being actively obliterated.

So much for the criteria of class affiliation as understood by Marxists.

As far as the intelligentsia is concerned, it does not constitute a class from the standpoint of scientific communism, from the standpoint of the totality of distinguishing features of classes. Defining the intelligentsia's place in the social structure of bourgeois society, Lenin pointed out that it constitutes "*a special stratum of modern capitalist society*",¹ that it "is not an *independent* economic class and therefore is not an *independent* political force".² The intelligentsia is not a class, first of all because it does not have the principal characteristic of a class—a specific relation to the means of production distinguishing it in this respect from the working class, the peasantry, the bourgeoisie or the petty bourgeoisie.

Lenin listed among the intelligentsia "all educated people, the members of the liberal professions,

¹ Lenin, *Coll. Works*, Vol. 7, p. 269.

² *Ibid.*, Vol. 11, p. 380.

the brain workers, as the English call them, as distinct from manual workers.”¹ It is clear from this that Lenin regarded the character and content of the labour of the intelligentsia, and the possession of a special education by it, as grounds for singling it out as a special social group. The reasons why the intelligentsia remains a special social stratum right until the building of a Communist society were connected by Lenin with the persistence to a certain extent of the social division of mental and manual labour, with the fact that the intelligentsia has a higher general educational level and special training as compared with the other working people.

In the light of these methodological principles formulated by Lenin, the intelligentsia can be distinguished as a special social group (or stratum) mainly by *the work it performs in the social division of labour* (exacting mental work), *its role in the social organisation of labour*, and its performance of specific managerial functions in production and other social fields. Precisely this *character of the labour* of the intelligentsia presupposes a *high cultural and technical level* and special education, which distinguish the intelligentsia from the main body of workers engaged in manual labour.

This does not at all mean that the intelligentsia is some “supra-class” stratum. Different elements of the intelligentsia are closely connected with the classes existing in society, serve and express their interests, are close to them in their own interests, are recruited from their ranks, and differ little from them in respect of daily living

¹ Lenin, *Coll. Works*, Vol. 7, p. 324.

conditions, material position, ideology, psychology and political outlook. Therefore scientific communism regards the intelligentsia in capitalist society and in the transitional period from capitalism to socialism as an inter-class *layer*, and distinguishes between the bourgeois, petty-bourgeois and proletarian intelligentsia. In socialist society the intelligentsia ceases to be socially divided, loses the character of an inter-class layer and becomes a social *stratum*, the people's, socialist intelligentsia, closely connected with the working class and the collectives of agricultural workers, drawing near to them but not merging with them, retaining its social specificity.

A member of the intelligentsia is engaged in creative work of the mind or, in the servicing field, in mental work of a complicated and demanding nature. In material production he is involved in scientific, design, technological, organisational, economic and other work. Finally, he may be engaged in managing production or other spheres of social life.

The intelligentsia will continue to retain its social specificity and will not merge with the rest of society so long as the need exists for the performance of these functions by a certain stratum of the population (since these functions cannot as yet be performed by all members of society) due to material, technical, economic, social, political and cultural conditions. But this will no longer be a special social stratum when communist development reaches the point where intellectual and manual work merge in production activity in which everybody is engaged, where the working people have the opportunities and necessary training for performing the social func-

tions that are now performed exclusively by the intelligentsia.

What are the objective dialectics of the process of the drawing closer together and fusion of the intelligentsia with the working class and the peasantry?

The social division of labour into mental and manual work resulting from the development of the productive forces occurred in a class-divided society on the basis of private property. Mental work became essentially the monopoly of the economically and politically dominant class and its learned servants. This was the basis of the social antithesis between mental and manual labour, an antithesis arising from the division of society into antagonistic classes.

Engels wrote: "So long as the really working population were so much occupied with their necessary labour that they had no time left for looking after the common affairs of society—the direction of labour, affairs of state, legal matters, art, science, etc.—so long was it necessary that there should constantly exist a special class, freed from actual labour, to manage these affairs; and this class never failed, for its own advantage, to impose a greater and greater burden of labour on the working masses."¹

The exploiting classes are rendered superfluous by the modern productive forces, whose development has been greatly promoted by large-scale industry. Conditions therefore exist for eliminating the abnormal division of labour and the antithesis between mental and manual work. The obstacle to this is the capitalist production relations.

¹ Frederick Engels, *Anti-Dühring*, Foreign Languages Publishing House, Moscow, 1962, p. 251.

Marx constantly drew attention to the antithesis between mental and manual work inherent in capitalism. He wrote: "The separation of the intellectual powers of production from the manual labour, and the conversion of those powers into the might of capital over labour, is . . . finally completed by modern industry erected on the foundation of machinery."¹ He noted elsewhere that under capitalism "the labourer is brought face to face with the intellectual potencies of the material process of production, as the property of another, and as a ruling power. This separation begins in simple cooperation, where the capitalist represents to the single workman, the oneness and the will of the associated labour. It is developed in manufacture which cuts down the labourer into a detail labourer. It is completed in modern industry, which makes science a productive force distinct from labour and presses it into the service of capital."² Marx says that in bourgeois society the "forces of nature and science . . . confront the labourers as *powers* of capital . . . And in fact all these applications of science, natural forces and products of labour on a large scale, these applications founded on *social labour*, themselves appear only as *means for the exploitation* of labour, as

¹ *Capital*, Vol. 1, p. 423.

² *Ibid.*, p. 361. In this context, Marx quotes William Thompson, the Irish economist and Utopian socialist whose work was published in 1824: "The man of knowledge and the productive labourer come to be widely divided from each other, and knowledge, instead of remaining the handmaid of labour in the hand of the labourer to increase his productive powers has almost everywhere arrayed itself against labour . . . systematically deluding and leading them (the labourers) astray in order to render their muscular powers entirely mechanical and obedient."

means of appropriating surplus-labour, and hence confront labour as *powers* belonging to capital.”¹

The relations between persons engaged in intellectual work and those engaged in manual work have greatly changed since Marx said that. And Garaudy's allegations that Marxist-Leninists ignore the major changes in the position of the intelligentsia and its relations with the working class are totally invalid.

In the early 1890's, Engels noted a trend towards a drawing together of broad sections of the intelligentsia and the working class, and said that there would come to this class a significant number of young specialists in the technical and medical fields, and lawyers and teachers, so as to organise, with the help of Party comrades, the management of the factories and big estates in the interests of the nation. On May 11, 1893, in an interview with a correspondent of the French newspaper *Le Figaro*, Engels said: "...Our ideas are spreading everywhere, among workers, teachers, doctors, lawyers, and so on. If we had to take over power tomorrow, we should need engineers, chemists and agriculturalists. But what of it! I am quite sure that, already, many of them would be with us."

The continuing trend for the drawing together of the intelligentsia and the proletariat in the capitalist countries was closely studied by Lenin. He noted: "In all spheres of people's labour, capitalism increases the number of *office and professional workers* with particular rapidity and makes a growing demand for intellectuals."² He also pointed out that intellectuals "occupy a special

¹ *Theories of Surplus-Value*, Part I, p. 391-392.

² Lenin, *Coll. Works*, Vol. 4, p. 202.

position among the other classes, attaching themselves partly to the bourgeoisie by their connections, their outlooks, etc., and partly to the wage-workers as capitalism increasingly deprives the intellectual of his independent position, converts him into a hired worker and threatens to lower his living standard.”¹

Stressing that the proletariat was interested in winning the intelligentsia over to its side, Lenin wrote: “Like any other class in modern society, the proletariat is not only advancing intellectuals from its own midst, but also accepts into its ranks supporters from the midst of all and sundry educated people.”²

Lenin kept a close watch on the processes that were taking place among the intelligentsia in capitalist countries under the impact of the Great October Socialist Revolution and the general crisis of capitalism. In an interview with Jakob Friis, he said that what might be called an “engineering proletariat” was emerging in the West, and that engineers were “everywhere partly on our side”. He also said that it was “extremely important to win the engineers over to our side”.

In his letter to Charles Steinmetz in April, 1922, Lenin wrote: “In all the countries of the world there is growing—more slowly than one would like, but irresistibly and unswervingly—the number of representatives of science, technology, art, who are becoming convinced of the necessity of replacing capitalism by a different socio-economic system...”³

¹ Lenin, *Coll. Works*, Vol. 4, p. 202.

² *Ibid.*, Vol. 6, p. 198.

³ *Ibid.*, Vol. 35, p. 552.

New, important changes in the composition of the "collective labourer" are taking place today under the growing dominance of state-monopoly capitalism and the scientific and technological revolution. Firstly, its boundaries are expanding; along with workers, the "collective labourer" now comprises engineers and technicians, scientific workers employed in industry and the administrative personnel of enterprises. Secondly, the proportions of the various parts making up the "collective labourer" are changing. As distinct from the times of Marx, when scientifically educated personnel were, in his words, "numerically unimportant", today the proportion of technical specialists in the production personnel averages 20-30 per cent, and in some new industries they account for more than half of the total work force. Thirdly, the social differentiation of that part of the "collective labourer" which belongs to the category of intellectual workers is increasing. Many engineers and administrators continue to take a direct or indirect part in the mechanism of exploitation, stand close to the class of the bourgeoisie and sometimes merge with it. On the other hand, the functions of the mental work of an increasing proportion of the intellectual and office workers are becoming divorced from the functions of exploitation. Rank-and-file engineering, technical, scientific and office workers do not own the means of production. They belong to the labour force, lose their previous social privileges and are exploited by the capitalists. They no longer function as overseers of the workers or help to exploit them, but take part in material production or work in the service field. This, however, does not give any grounds for listing this category of workers among the working class. While being prole-

tarianised in the *economic* sense, *socially* they continue to differ from the working class.

Scientific and technological progress results in a higher proportion of intellectual labour in the production activity of workers, and at the same time an increase in the number of engineers and technicians who take a direct part in material production. In a number of sectors of production general educational and specific requirements are so high that skilled technicians and even engineers work as workers. These technicians and engineers belong to the working class as its most highly qualified stratum. What we have in this instance, however, is not the entry into the working class of certain groups of engineering and technical personnel, i. e., the intelligentsia, but the formation, within the working class, of a stratum of workers with a special technical education. Moreover, the number of technicians and engineers within the working class is still comparatively small. In his report to the 19th Congress of the French Communist Party, Georges Marchais said that out of the approximately two million engineers, technicians and managerial workers in France (the figure given in the 1968 census) only 4 or 5 per cent belong to the working class. But this percentage naturally varies from country to country and a reliable estimate would require special study.

Thus, the working intelligentsia is progressively *drawing closer* to the working class. For the reasons indicated above, and due to the level of their income, and their unstable economic position connected with the threat of unemployment arising from the mechanisation and automation of intellectual work, etc., some of the intelligentsia are drawing closer to the working class, increasingly taking the same stand as the working class on po-

litical issues, participating with it in strikes, and using working-class methods of struggle.

It is important to stress that the changes in the position of this group of the intelligentsia and in its relations with the working class are not the direct result of the scientific and technological revolution. They arise from the growing exploitation of the working intelligentsia by the monopolies, which use scientific and technological progress in their self-seeking interests. It is not the scientific and technological revolution as such, but the growing dissatisfaction with capitalist production relations (within whose framework the productive forces develop) that draws those engaged in non-manual work into the class struggle against the bourgeoisie and makes them allies of the working class.

But there are not only socio-economic causes but also political, moral and ideological factors that help to bring the working intelligentsia closer to the working class. Intellectual workers are increasingly protesting against monopoly rule, the anti-democratic and inhuman nature of imperialism, the aggressive policy of the ruling classes, and against racialism, chauvinism, and the spiritual poverty of capitalist society.

Thus, in capitalist countries, the relations of many groups of intellectual and office workers with the working class are now determined *not by the antithesis and divergence of their vital interests, but by the growing identity of these interests*. Accordingly, the International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties of 1969, as part of its general strategy, called for an *alliance between intellectual and manual workers* in the fight for peace, democracy and social progress.

Today, when the social basis of the anti-mono-

poly movement has greatly expanded and includes the vast majority of both manual and non-manual workers, the enemies of Marxism-Leninism are trying to cause divisions within the anti-monopoly forces by setting the working class against the intellectual workers and other contingents of wage workers. The revisionists, too, are engaged in these subversive activities. The Leftist, Maoist elements directly list the intelligentsia among the class enemies of the working class, while Garaudy and other revisionists try to discredit the policy of the Communist parties by accusing them of underestimating the part played by the intelligentsia.

The Marxist-Leninist parties carefully study and analyse the social processes taking place in the capitalist countries, and Garaudy's assertions to the contrary are entirely without foundation.

In his address to the 1969 International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties, General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Leonid Brezhnev said: "Many aspects of work with the intelligentsia, especially with that section of it which together with the working class is engaged in industry and is being subjected to growing exploitation, should be seen in their new context. The professions requiring mental work are becoming more widespread. The engineering and technical intelligentsia in the capitalist countries is now being drawn not only from the bourgeoisie but also from the middle sections and in part from among the working people as well. To a considerable extent all this is changing the intelligentsia's attitude to the capitalist system and bringing its interests closer to those of the working class."¹

¹ *International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties. Moscow, 1969, Prague, 1969, pp. 150-151.*

The meeting summed up the discussion of the role of the intelligentsia in the contemporary capitalist world as follows: "In this age, when science is becoming a direct productive force, growing numbers of intellectuals are swelling the ranks of wage and salary workers. Their social interests intertwine with those of the working class; their creative aspirations clash with the interests of the monopoly employers, who place profit above all else. Despite the great diversity in their positions, different groups of intellectuals are coming more and more into conflict with the monopolies and the imperialist policy of governments. The crisis of bourgeois ideology and the attraction of socialism help to bring intellectuals into the anti-imperialist struggle. The alliance of workers by hand and by brain is becoming an increasingly important force in the struggle for peace, democracy and social progress, for the democratic control of production, of cultural institutions and information media and for the development of public education in the interests of the people."¹

Consequently, the fact that considerable sections of the working intelligentsia are drawing closer to the working class in capitalist countries is playing an important part in the development of the class struggle. The working intelligentsia, office employees and the working class make up an army of wage-labour exploited by the capitalists. Intellectual and manual workers exploited by the capitalists are not in conflict with one another. On the contrary, their interests and positions in many respects coincide, making possible a strong alliance between them. However, the work of the

¹ *International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties, Moscow, 1969, Prague, 1969, p. 25.*

intelligentsia does conflict with the interests of the working class when it is used by the ruling class to oppress and exploit manual workers.

Lenin said that the problem of promoting "mutual understanding and friendship between workers by hand and brain whom capitalism kept apart"¹ will be solved after the socialist revolution, when the workers' state has been established.

But under capitalism, the ruling class, relying on the power of private property, continues to command most areas of intellectual activity and direct it towards the satisfaction of its mercenary interests, even though an increasing number of working intellectuals have been breaking away from the bourgeoisie. The vital interests of the working class are directly opposed to those of the intelligentsia who either form part of the bourgeois class as its highly-educated stratum or else faithfully serve that class, this opposition becoming more acute. It is in the *social interests* of the bourgeoisie that the intelligentsia should work for it, and it tries to set intellectuals against the manual workers.

Formal bourgeois democracy virtually prevents the workers from holding political office and from managing social affairs. Also, the differences between the intelligentsia and the main body of the working class in the level of general and technical education, material standard and everyday living, etc. are preserved.

The following figures illustrate the differences in earnings between manual workers and brain workers. In 1969, in the United States, the average wages of engineers and technicians were almost

¹ Lenin, *Coll. Works*, Vol. 29, p. 136.

16 times those of agricultural workers, 5.3 times those of unskilled workers in non-agricultural branches, 2.1 times those of semi-skilled workers, and 70 per cent higher than those of skilled workers.

In its political outlook the intelligentsia is influenced by its unstable, intermediate social position, its social origins (largely bourgeois or petty-bourgeois) and by its education. As a result, it is to a large extent subject to petty-bourgeois illusions and vacillations.

Dealing with the ills of capitalist society, Lenin stressed that the antithesis between intellectual and physical work is "one of the principal sources of modern *social* inequality—a source, moreover, which cannot on any account be removed immediately by the mere conversion of the means of production into public property, by the mere expropriation of the capitalists."¹

In both the advanced capitalist countries and the socialist countries, externally similar changes are taking place in the vocational structure of the working class. Under both systems, owing to the scientific and technological revolution, workers engaged in mechanised, automated and similar processes have an increasing amount of mental work to do. A growing number of workers have a good general and specialised education, necessary to carry out this work. Thus, in this respect they are drawing closer to engineers and technicians.

But under capitalism and socialism, due to the different natures of the two systems, there are fundamental differences in the content and direction of these processes. Under capitalism the aim

¹ Lenin, *Coll. Works*, Vol. 25, p. 468.

is to consolidate and perpetuate social antitheses and differences; under socialism steps are taken to eliminate social differences and create conditions for communist social equality and homogeneity.

Under socialism workers are not merely engaged in work demanding an increasingly higher level of general and technical education (this is so under capitalism too); they are also involved in activities beyond their normal work. Under socialism they play an important part in local government bodies and in community affairs, and in the activities of Party, trade union and Young Communist League organisations. Workers are active in the field of inventions and work rationalisation proposals, take part in the work of voluntary research and development bureaus, economic analysis groups, assist in the establishment of work quotas, and with personnel work, and so on. Many workers play an active part in a wide range of cultural activities. Under socialism an increasing number of workers are performing work or are engaged in activities of an intellectual nature that formerly was the almost exclusive province of the intelligentsia.

The general educational and cultural level and technical qualifications of workers are rising rapidly. There are extensive possibilities for obtaining higher and specialised secondary education, which may be done without discontinuing work. Differences in the standard of living of manual as compared to non-manual workers are being eliminated.

Nevertheless, at the present stage of socialist society important differences remain as to the content of work, cultural level and level of technical

training of engineers, technical specialists and scientists on the one hand, and the greater part of the working class and farm workers on the other. These differences will be entirely eliminated only in a communist society, that is, in a society of harmoniously developed people.

Lenin considered that the division of labour between people, as described above, would be eliminated as a "future result of a fully developed, fully stabilised and constituted, fully comprehensive and mature communism".¹ He said that the intelligentsia, "as a separate social stratum . . . will persist until we have reached the highest stage of development of communist society".²

As we can see, both capitalist and socialist reality refute the assertions of Garaudy, Fischer and other revisionists to the effect that the working class has merged with scientific and technical personnel, social differences between them having allegedly disappeared. It is true that in the course of the scientific and technological revolution *closer ties* are being established between the working class and the intelligentsia, the working class playing the leading part in the process, and this applies both to capitalist and socialist societies. *But this does not mean that they are merging*, since social differences between them continue to exist.

In capitalist society, under the impact of the scientific and technological revolution, only certain material and cultural prerequisites are being created for the elimination of differences between intellectual and manual workers. The differences

¹ Lenin, *Coll. Works*, Vol. 31, p. 50.

² *Ibid.*, Vol. 33, p. 194.

themselves cannot be eliminated without a socialist revolution.

Socialism achieves far more than does capitalism in eliminating the substantial distinctions between the working class and intellectual workers. But since it is only the first phase of communism, its cultural and socio-economic level of development is not high enough to eliminate them all. The intelligentsia will cease to be a separate social stratum, but this will not be achieved by its merging with the working class (or vice versa) as Garaudy and his supporters maintain. According to their metaphysical approach existing social categories (classes and strata) remain, it is only their boundaries that change, i. e., some are extended and others narrowed. But the dialectics of the process whereby social homogeneity is achieved are such that this occurs not when the intelligentsia merges with the working class and vice versa, but when the social differences between them are eliminated, when intellectual and manual work is inseparably combined in production activity, and when a qualitatively new, communist type of a harmoniously developed producer is formed from the working class, the worker on the land and the worker by intellect.

In revising the Marxist doctrine on the historic mission of the working class, Garaudy does not confine himself to the composition of the working class. Citing new phenomena in the bourgeois world in support, he tries, like other renegades, to subject Marxism-Leninism to a fundamental reassessment, holding that it is in need of "modification", of a "drastic rethinking".¹ He attempts to bring his conception of the composition of the

¹ *The Turning-Point of Socialism*, p. 10.

working class into line "with the logical consequences of that conception in regard to tactics, strategy and political organisation, and with the historical reality of classes and their relations".¹

Garaudy therefore distorts not only the Marxist-Leninist theory on the socio-class structure of capitalist society, but on the strategy and tactics for the working class in the revolutionary struggle, and on the driving forces of the revolutionary process in capitalist countries as a whole. This is the purpose of his concept of a "new historical bloc", which follows logically from his efforts to reduce the role of the working class and exaggerate the role of the intelligentsia.

According to Garaudy, his concept serves "to get rid of the scheme of a coalition between the manual and non-manual workers conceived in accordance with the model of an alliance between workers and peasants".² He holds that nothing more than a tactical alliance can be made with the middle classes *in the traditional sense* (Ed.) of the term (i. e., the peasantry, craftsmen and small traders). However, with the intelligentsia, according to Garaudy, it is necessary to establish a strategic alliance,³ since an alliance such as is applicable to the middle classes is out of the question. He calls this new "organic" union a "new historical bloc".

According to Garaudy, the "new historical bloc" consists of the working class "as traditionally defined" and the intelligentsia "in all its diversity (some of the latter are now virtually integrated with the working class while others, the 'liberal

¹ *The Turning-Point of Socialism*, p. 199.

² *Ibid.*, p. 198.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 197.

professions' in particular, are still much closer to the middle classes)".¹

In assigning scientific and technical personnel to the working class Garaudy tries to create the impression that he wants to build up the role of the working class. He uses the same tactics to cover up his anti-proletarian intentions when he writes hypocritically about the need for "a study of the new class relations which involves a rigorous definition of the 'new historical bloc' and which ultimately determines what claims are capable of forming its common denominator, thus ensuring a leading role within that 'bloc' for the working class in its new, expanded form".²

The "leading role" of the working class "in the new, expanded form" amounts, according to Garaudy, to leadership by scientists and technologists, who are included by him in the working class. Of the prospects of the "new historical bloc" in the United States Garaudy says that "there can be no doubt that the primary role will be played by the engineers, technologists and administrators."³

Garaudy advances the idea of the "equality" of the social forces of the "new historical bloc" and, making much of the importance of the role of all classes and social strata, ignores the leading part played by the working class among all groups of working people. A similar stand is taken by sociologists of the capitalist world who attack the Marxist doctrine on the leading role of the proletariat by energetically spreading the eclectic theory of the "plurality" of social strata—their

¹ *The Turning-Point of Socialism*, p. 200.

² *Ibid.*

³ *Ibid.*, p. 66.

allegedly equal social importance. With little regard for consistency, these sociologists then give preference to the "middle class", by which they mean intellectual workers and office workers, all manner of employers and businessmen, and the top members of the working class.

Garaudy persists in contending that the component elements of the "new historical bloc" are not interdependent. He says: "The demand to take an active part in **determining** the aims and purport of production is thus the common factor which unites the aspirations of students and the intelligentsia with the aims of the working class. *Hence, the question of inter-relationships as regards rivalry or subordination (let alone antagonism) does not arise.* The workers' movement and the movement of students and of the intelligentsia are components of a single whole."¹ He thus openly opposes his views to the basic principles of Marxism-Leninism, in particular the substantiation of the historical role of the working class. Lenin stressed that the most important element of the Marxist theory was its elucidation of the historical role of the proletariat as the builder of socialist society.

Acknowledgement of the working class as the leader of all the revolutionary forces in the struggle against the bourgeois system reflects the existing relations in contemporary capitalist society. Denial of this leadership arising from the course of capitalist development implies the renunciation of the Marxist-Leninist proposition on the historical, leading role of the working class in the revolutionary struggle against the exploiting classes. The working class plays the leading revolutionary

¹ *Pour un modèle français du socialisme*, p. 19.

role in the fight of the working people in capitalist society because, while being an exploited class which does not own the means of production, it is connected with the most progressive form of the economy, i. e., large-scale mechanised production. Working conditions in an enterprise unite the workers (whose numerical strength runs into millions) into a single force with the capacity to fight the exploiting classes. The working class, the most organised and most disciplined social force, is fighting both for its day-to-day objectives and its ultimate aims and, in so doing, it expresses the interests of the whole anti-monopoly movement. It is therefore the vanguard of all revolutionary forces today.

Lenin wrote: "Only a definite class, namely, the urban workers and the factory, industrial workers in general, is able to lead the whole mass of the working and exploited people in the struggle to throw off the yoke of capital, in actually carrying it out, in the struggle to maintain and consolidate the victory, in the work of creating the new, socialist social system and in the entire struggle for the complete abolition of classes."¹

The struggle between the bourgeoisie and the working class brings out clearly their conflicting aims: the bourgeoisie seeks to preserve the existing capitalist system, while the working class unrelentingly strives to achieve a socialist revolution in order to secure its liberation and that of the entire exploited and oppressed section of society. Its leading role in the revolutionary struggle is demonstrated in the establishment of a broad anti-imperialist front headed by the working class.

As his writings show clearly, Garaudy regards

¹ Lenin, *Coll. Works*, Vol. 29, p. 420.

the working class merely as a rank-and-file "element" within the revolutionary movement, and calls for the autonomisation of every contingent taking part in the anti-monopoly struggle. Such notions mean belittling the role of the working class, and lead to nothing less than disuniting the revolutionary forces, confining each of them within the framework of limited aims and depriving them of their main strategic objective, the overthrow of the existing social system.

As for "subordination" in the camp of the anti-imperialist forces, it has always existed and will continue to exist: it evolves from the balance of the class forces. The leading role of the working class, heading all the anti-imperialist forces, is not established by decree; it is the objective result of the development of capitalist society.

The contemporary working class is naturally not completely uniform and it would be an oversimplification to assert that it is equally capable of effective leadership of the anti-imperialist forces in all countries. Working-class consciousness develops unevenly. It is the experience gained in the class struggle, past or present, that determines the class awareness of a particular contingent of the proletariat. Those contingents which have gained wide experience in the revolutionary struggle extend and deepen the class awareness of other workers. But this process, though progressing, is far from being completed yet.

There are many causes to explain why, in the capitalist world, a single class consciousness of all contingents of the working class cannot be established rapidly. First of all, objective reality becomes more difficult to understand as its complexity grows. In the past, when the working people were exploited openly and kept permanently in a

state of dire poverty, the proletarians could clearly see that they were a most destitute and brutally exploited class. Today it is more difficult for the average worker to comprehend the various forms of capitalist exploitation and suppression of human personality. He is not clearly aware of this exploitation owing to the intricate system of economic domination, the intense social demagoguery practised, and the adoption of increasingly refined methods of acquiring surplus-value.

As the working class improves its standard of living and wrests some democratic rights from the ruling classes, its struggle covers a wider range and includes increasingly complex social issues. Many workers are not able to perceive immediately the intricate connection that links their difficult living conditions and the capitalist system and therefore have no clear picture of the prospects and potentialities of their struggle.

Secondly, Western propaganda does its utmost to undermine the class awareness of the proletariat. Modern life, with all its complexities, is presented in such a way as to make it appear that class contradictions and, more particularly, class antagonisms are disappearing and that some sort of an "affluent society" is in the making. Moreover, it is contended that, since the Great Depression of the 1930's, advanced capitalist countries have set up an economic and political system which precludes serious crises and ensures such high living standards for the working class in these countries that there is no longer any need for revolutionary changes.

Thirdly, contemporary reformism and revisionism serve to greatly assist the bourgeoisie in disuniting the ranks of the international working-class movement and impeding the development

of class awareness. Despite the apparent differences between them, both reformism and revisionism objectively provide ammunition for the ruling capitalist class, which is interested above all else in demobilising the class forces opposed to imperialism. Today's reformists have entrenched themselves in social-democratic parties, which exert an influence over a considerable number of workers. International opportunism thus does great harm to the unity of action and solidarity of all contingents of the working class. But the workers' class struggle intensifies in spite of the great obstacles to working-class unity and to the establishment of a strong anti-imperialist front of the working people.

The scale and intensity of the working people's class struggle against the policy of monopoly capital shows that the working class is playing an increasing part in the socio-economic and political life of the capitalist world. In Britain the number of workers involved in strike action rose from 302,000 in 1950 to 1,705,000 in 1972, in Japan from 763,500 to 1,669,000 and in the United States from 1,320,000 in 1960 to 1,700,000 in 1972. The total number of strikers in the six major capitalist countries increased from 8,619,200 in 1950 to 15,816,000 in 1972.

Further evidence of the growing militancy of the working class is that many of its actions have been of an expressly political character. In Britain, for instance, strikes have been aimed against the bourgeois state and its class legislation. This is a new phenomenon for British trade-unionism. On 22 July, 1972, for the first time since the General Strike of 1926, the TUC General Council called for an official general strike to obtain the release of five leaders of striking London dockers jailed by the Industrial Tribunal set up on the ba-

sis of the anti-labour Industrial Relations Act. The Conservative government was compelled to back down and release the dockers. The main demands of the strikers were satisfied.

Italian workers are combining their immediate economic demands with a demand for urgently needed reforms on a nationwide scale. The beginning of 1973 was marked by a new wave of anti-monopoly actions by the Italian working class. On 12 January, 1973, twenty million workers downed tools in a general strike called by the three largest trade union centres. The strikers demanded more jobs and the ending of unemployment, development of the southern regions of the country, new economic and social policies, and a strengthening of democracy in the republic.

All of this proves the correctness of the statement of the Communist and Workers' Parties that *"In the citadels of capitalism the working class, as recent events have shown, is the principal driving force of the revolutionary struggle, of the entire anti-imperialist democratic movement."*¹

Garaudy disputes these facts of contemporary capitalist reality and virtually ignores the leading role played by the working class among the anti-monopoly forces. On this fundamental issue he breaks with Marxism and aligns himself with Right-wing reformists and the ideological spokesmen for capitalism.

But what Garaudy's "new historical bloc" boils down to is not merely a denial of the leading role of the working class in the revolutionary struggle. In his scheme of uniting the intelligentsia with the working class he goes further and explicitly em-

¹ *International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties*, p. 24.

phasises the leading role of the intelligentsia. He writes about the contradictions "arising in the United States, as in the capitalist world generally, out of the consequences of the new scientific and technological revolution" and changes deriving from it "in the structure of the working class" and "in the relationship between production and market in such countries as the United States" as a result of "the increasingly important part played by science in the development of the productive forces". These changes, he argues, are "responsible for the new role of whole categories of the intelligentsia, notably engineers, cadres and scientific research workers, both as immediate productive forces and as an integral part of the working class".¹

Marxism-Leninism does not deny the active and important role of the working intelligentsia. On the contrary, it stresses that the role of the working intelligentsia increases as the scientific and technological revolution progresses. But this role cannot be effectively expressed *independently* of the main confrontation, which is between the working class and the bourgeoisie. Herein lies the inadmissibility of revisionist attempts to ascribe to the intelligentsia the leading role within the workers' movement. In fact, they render a disservice to the intelligentsia by opposing it to the working class, for this opposition may obstruct the intelligentsia's fight for its own social and professional interests as well as the general struggle for unity in a broad anti-monopoly front.

Marxist-Leninists have never maintained (contrary to what Garaudy asserts) that the working

¹ *The Whole Truth*, p. 95.

class and the working intelligentsia have competing or even antagonistic relations. Of course, the working class stands in opposition to that stratum of the intelligentsia which directly serves the monopolists, receives a share in the surplus-value and is not directly connected with material production—the managers and executives of private firms and state enterprises, the politicians and lawyers, and the journalists and other specialists in the ideological manipulation of the masses, all of whom directly serve the ruling class. But these account for only a small proportion of the intelligentsia as a whole that we have been dealing with, and therefore the attitude of the working class towards them cannot be identified with its attitude towards the entire intelligentsia.

The working class has always regarded the working intelligentsia as its ally in the fight against the bourgeoisie. This is especially true today, when the greater part of the intelligentsia and white-collar workers (technicians, engineers, laboratory assistants, draughtsmen, office employees, shop assistants, etc.) is steadily drawing closer to the proletariat as the interests of the two groups increasingly coincide in their joint anti-imperialist struggle.

In the history of the world revolutionary movement the progressive intelligentsia has played a great part as an ally of the proletariat in its struggle against the bourgeoisie.

The status of the proletariat, the level of the workers' movement and its role differ within one and the same country, from country to country and from one group of countries to another. At times certain sections of the workers' movement deviate from the "ideal" line which strict theory

would indicate. The imperialists are quick to take advantage of such situations and use all possible means to try and influence the workers and instil in them nationalist, chauvinist, racist and other prejudices, thereby distracting them from the class struggle. In various countries, therefore, the situation arises where the workers' movement has not yet reached the stage of conscious and organised struggle; then the revolutionary intelligentsia, with its knowledge and understanding of the urgency of current problems, frequently does lead the revolutionary movement. But this part can be played effectively only by the progressive, anti-imperialist intelligentsia which is objectively on the side of the working class and which comprehends the ideology of Marxism-Leninism. In this case the revolutionary intelligentsia helps to bring the workers and the broad sections of the working people to the realisation of the need for revolutionary change.

In recent years, owing to scientific and technological progress, the demand for specialists of all kinds has increased enormously. The number of engineering, technical, scientific and office workers has accordingly risen sharply. In the United States, engineering and technical personnel and office workers accounted for 7.7 per cent of the gainfully employed population at the beginning of the century. By the 1960's this proportion had risen to 26 per cent. The increase in Britain was from 8.6 per cent to 23 per cent and in France from 10.4 per cent to 23.6 per cent.

The rapid numerical growth of brain workers, especially engineering and technical personnel, has significantly changed the proportion of brain workers engaged in production. In France engineers and technicians make up 25 per cent of the

labour force in the chemical industry, 30 per cent in the power industry, 50 per cent in the electronics industry and 60 per cent in the oil industry. It is estimated that in five years' time engineers, administrative personnel and technicians in France will account for one-fifth of the total industrial labour force.

Monopoly capitalism is undermining and destroying the privileged position of the intelligentsia. An increasing number of the working intelligentsia and office employees are being brought down to the level of the workers. This is especially true of technicians, the most common categories of engineers, laboratory assistants, draughtsmen and clerical and sales staff, concentrated at large enterprises and coming more and more under the pressure of exploitation by the monopolists. The increasing similarity of working conditions of industrial workers, office workers, and this section of the working intelligentsia gives rise to many common demands in their fight for their rights. Such demands as the right to form their own organisations, to pay differentials according to qualifications, and to additional benefits and better social security, are of special importance to office workers and engineering and technical personnel. Thus, in the present situation, working conditions and, indeed, the living standards of workers and some sections of the working intelligentsia as described above are steadily becoming more alike; at the same time differences continue to exist between them, and these must be taken into account when describing the classes and strata of contemporary capitalist society.

In his latest published works Garaudy tries to broaden the front of his attacks against the funda-

mental principles of Marxism-Leninism. Tailoring basic economic propositions to suit himself, he not only renounces Marxism-Leninism but opposes it with his own views which he says are a "creative development" of Marxist-Leninist science in conditions of the scientific and technological revolution. In the same breath he denounces as dogmatists all those who reject his interpretation of the social effect of this revolution on capitalist society. In point of fact, having failed to grasp the intricate complex of new problems that have arisen at the present stage of social development and to see the interconnections between them, Garaudy breaks with Marxism, declaring that its economic and political theory is no longer applicable and is in need of "thorough revision".¹ Renouncing Marxism-Leninism as the theoretical foundation for the building of socialist society, he proceeds to condemn the real socialism that has been built upon this foundation, failing to see in it a radical alternative to capitalist society, and declares that it is impossible to remake social life "by advancing along the present path." Only in this sense can one understand his statement that the very way of posing the question should be changed. "It is necessary to proceed," he says, "not from ideologies which oppose us to one another, but from problems common to us."²

Initially Garaudy advanced his revisionist views in a somewhat camouflaged form; today he casts off the camouflage and openly challenges Marx's views as "antiquated." He rejects them because they do not conform to his concept of the "new historical bloc." In this connection Garaudy

¹ *L'Alternative*, p. 11.

² *Ibid.*, p. 5.

calls for revising the basic conclusions of Marx's theory of value.¹

Garaudy deals at special length with the correlation between materialised and living labour. While formally linking his reasoning to the conceptual scheme worked out by Marx², he falsifies Marx's concepts and ideas, trying to affirm his anti-Marxist concept of the "new historical bloc." His line of reasoning boils down to the following. In the course of the scientific and technological revolution there has been a big rise in labour productivity, as a result of which the proportion of materialised labour in the product has grown enormously and that of living labour has shrunk, correspondingly, to a minimum. As a consequence, the role of living labour in the production of surplus-value has diminished to a very low level, if not to naught. Living labour in the old (Marxist) sense does not exist any longer. The produced commodity consists almost wholly of materialised, that is, past labour.

However, if living labour has been "done away with," then what labour is it that produces surplus-value, the size of which has grown enormously in our time? After all, as we know from science, materialised labour cannot produce surplus-value. Garaudy solves this problem with the greatest of ease. He tells us that materialised labour, that is, past labour, is able to produce absolute surplus-value today, and declares the correlation between materialised and living labour, discovered by Marx, is "obsolete" and no longer of any theoretical or practical value. Garaudy's theoretical postulate is based mainly on the in-

¹ *L'Alternative*, p. 180.

² *Theories of Surplus-Value*, Part III, pp. 275-276.

creasing part being played by science in the production process as a direct productive force, and the certain change that has taken place in the socio-productive function of the scientific and technological intelligentsia.

Adducing the above argument to substantiate his proposition that materialised labour creates absolute surplus-value, Garaudy calls this labour not materialised or past labour, but living labour, and seeks to prove, through a series of verbal manipulations, that the present living labour of the working class is reduced to an absolute minimum and for all practical purposes plays no part in the production of surplus-value. At the same time we are told that the living labour of the scientific and technological intelligentsia today forms the basis of the surplus-value received by monopoly capital. In this way Garaudy seeks to prove that the working class as the principal agent of living labour in the Marxist understanding ceases to be the principal producer of surplus-value whereas the scientific and technological intelligentsia as the main agent of living labour in Garaudy's understanding, becomes the principal producer of surplus-value. Thus a model is constructed by Garaudy to conform to his "new historical bloc" in which the intelligentsia plays the principal part while the working class is consigned to oblivion. All of this, however, is at variance both with the laws of economic science and with reality.

The founders of Marxism-Leninism repeatedly stressed in their works that the development of science and technology was a continuous process which, in fact, had no limit. And this naturally meant that there would be a constant growth of labour productivity. As Lenin wrote, "technical progress is expressed precisely in the fact that

the work of machines pushes human labour more and more into the background.”¹ Consequently, the founders of Marxism-Leninism were well aware that the ratio between materialised and living labour was steadily changing in favour of the former. This process was evident a hundred years ago, and it proceeds with greater intensity today.

But does this give grounds for completely excluding living labour (in the scientific understanding) from the process of production of the commodity and hence for denying the decisive role of the working class in the production process, in the production of surplus-value? Marx gives a very definite answer to this question, saying that “the *increase of wealth*, the increase of the value contained in the commodity, and the extent of this increase, depends upon the greater or less quantity of living labour which the materialised labour sets in motion.”²

The first important step towards freeing the production process from the limitations imposed by the physical capacities of the worker is connected with the appearance and extensive industrial application of machines, which constituted a new qualitative stage in the development of production means as compared with the hand tools of the artisan. The transference to a machine of the function formerly performed by man with the aid of hand tools transformed the role of the immediate producer in the system of production, fundamentally changed the functions of his labour, and freed him from the necessity of direct, personal action on the object of labour. But the dependence on living labour of the production process in mechanised production as a whole re-

¹ Lenin, *Coll. Works*, Vol. 1, p. 85.

² *The Theories of Surplus-Value*, Part I, p. 77.

mains, though the character of this dependence changes. In mechanised production living labour takes the form not so much of the physical application of labour power as of actions of control, adjustment and regulation of the technological process. The content of the concept of directly productive labour changes accordingly.

As long as the problem of entrusting to the machine the motor and other working functions of labour remained unsolved, the new contradiction in the relationship between the subjective and objective factors of production, the contradiction between man's physical capacities and the growing requirements of the process of controlling production, remained hidden. Man's natural limitations become a serious obstacle to the progress of production. Since the functioning of the implements of labour acquires in the machine an independent character in relation to the worker, it becomes, as Marx wrote, "an industrial *perpetuum mobile*, that would go on producing forever, did it not meet with certain natural obstructions in the weak bodies... of its human attendants."¹ Thus the need arises for a new qualitative advance in the development of instruments of labour, principally so that man can transfer to the machine another basic function of directly productive labour, that of supervision, regulation and control. The achievement of this aim signifies the beginning of the epoch of automation of production.

The appearance and introduction of automatic machines working according to a fixed programme and relieving man of the function of direct control and regulation of the technological process

¹ *Capital*, Vol. 1, p. 403.

does not obviate the need for his direct participation in the operation of the production process as a whole. Working according to a fixed programme and having no freedom of choice, machines are incapable of performing "creative" functions or of reasoning, including the comparing of process data with past experience. Therefore, any unforeseen deviation from pre-set parameters leads to disorganisation. The reasoning or thought function thus continues to be performed by man, whose participation in the production process remains necessary. When carrying out the reasoning function of labour in organising production man appears in a quality most fully conforming to his essence as the intelligent and rational subject of labour. Thus the development of instruments of labour from one qualitative level to another not only changes substantially the place and role of the immediate producer in the technological process, but at the same time also intellectualises his labour. The increasing independence of production, consequently, is a progressive, natural and necessary tendency toward the intellectualisation of labour, a tendency which leads in the long run to fully bringing out man's true potentialities.

The revisionists' assertion that living labour has become fully transformed into materialised labour is an out-and-out revision of a central proposition of Marxism. But even if we agree to consider this view for a moment, how shall we explain the fact of the continuing growth of the numerical strength of the working class, the main agent of living labour? The change in the functions of the labour of workers in automated enterprises testifies not to the disappearance of living labour, but to the greater possibilities opened up by scientific and technological progress for trans-

ferring materialised labour to the newly-created commodity with a minimum expenditure of human abilities and energies, i.e., of living labour.

When speaking of the changes that have taken place in the nature of labour, it is necessary to bear in mind, firstly, the changes in the methods of transference of materialised, or past labour to the newly-created commodity that have been brought about by the immense growth of labour productivity and, secondly, the new function of automated systems making for the more productive application of living labour to the object of labour.

Karl Marx was the first to fully bring out the tremendous creative role of living labour in the production of all wealth, in the development of society and man himself. At present the large increase in the capital available and technical equipment of labour, and the objectification of the process of labour have again raised the question of man's role in the epoch of automation. With the transition of automation to its completed forms there takes place what was predicted by Marx: instead of serving as the main agent of production, man stands beside the process of production, becoming its supervisor and regulator.

Marx wrote: "Since the economists identify past labour with *capital*—past labour being understood in this case not only in the sense of concrete labour embodied in the product, but also in the sense of social labour, materialised labour-time—it is understandable that they, the Pindars of capital, emphasise the *objective* elements of production and overestimate their importance as against the *subjective element*, living, immediate labour. For them, labour only becomes efficacious

when it becomes *capital* and confronts itself, the passive element confronting its active counterpart. The producer is therefore controlled by the product, the subject by the object, labour which is being embodied by labour embodied in an object, etc. In all these conceptions, past labour appears not merely as an objective factor of living labour, subsumed by it, but vice versa; not as an element of the power of living labour, but as a power over this labour. The economists ascribe a false importance to the material factors of labour compared with labour itself in order to have also a *technological* justification for the *specific social form*, i.e., the *capitalist form*, in which the relationship of labour to the conditions of labour is turned upside-down, so that it is not the worker who makes use of the conditions of labour, but the conditions of labour which make use of the worker.”¹

In “abolishing” living labour Garaudy pursues the aim of belittling the historical mission of the working class, its historical perspective. His attempts to assign the functions of living labour only to the scientific and technological intelligentsia represent nothing other than an opposing of this intelligentsia to the working class. Such are the results of Garaudy’s “researches.” Ignoring living labour, the most important, the most dynamic, the most revolutionary part of labour in production, he belittles the role of the prime producers in social production. “The role of scientific research and technical creation in extended reproduction of capital has become such in our epoch,” he writes, “that Marx’s initial model for the formation of value must be cardinally

¹ *Theories of Surplus-Value*, Part III, pp. 275-76.

changed.”¹ In order to make such categorical statements one must be in possession of sufficiently weighty proof of qualitative changes in the relation of workers both to the means of labour and to the objects of labour. However, we find no proof of this in reality.

The production process is always, under all conditions, at any level of development of society and the means of labour, a human process and obeys the formula: subject—means—object. Just as the production process is inconceivable without the object of production and means of production, so is it inconceivable without the subject of production. Therefore the historical process of the automatisation of production is always conditional and relative. What it signifies is not a rupture of the “man—tool—nature” chain, not the conversion of the production process into something mystical independent of man the producer, the worker, and his aims, but only a growing complexity, a more indirect form of man’s connection with nature. The forms of man’s connection with nature expressed in the formula “subject—means—object” are progressively concretised in the course of mankind’s historical development as follows: “subject—hand tool—object,” “subject—machine—object,” “subject—automatic machine—object.” We may regard the process of the progressive refinement of the forms of the connection between the subject and the object through the means as being infinite, or, on the other hand, as being limited, but one thing is indisputable, namely, that at any stage in the development of the means of labour there will be different forms of the sub-

¹ *L’Alternative*, p. 183.

ject's connection with the object through these means.

By refining and making more indirect the forms whereby he acts upon nature, man is in reality drawing nearer to nature, increasing his mastery over it. By assigning more functions to production he makes means of labour serve more efficiently the subject, and his aims and requirements. Therefore, to regard the automation of production as a process which eliminates the worker from the system "subject—means—object," as a process of the phasing out of the directly productive labour of the worker, means not only to express reactionary social Utopias, but to evince an utter failure to grasp the essence of objective trends.

In asserting that the scientific and technological intelligentsia can be the principal agent of living labour Garaudy crudely distorts what Marx had to say about living, cooperative, materialised and universal labour. He writes that if Marx could say "Universal labour is all scientific labour" which depends partly on the cooperation of those existing at present, and partly on the utilisation of the labour of those who have preceded them, then today, when, as a UNESCO report says, 90 per cent of all scientists since the beginning of our civilisation live in our time, this definition has lost almost all of its validity, because almost all of "universal" (scientific) labour constitutes an integral part of "cooperative labour" (living labour).¹

Garaudy identifies materialised labour with universal labour, and living labour with cooperative labour. In reality these concepts are by no means

¹ *L'Alternative*, p. 185.

identical. "Universal labour is all scientific labour, all discovery and all invention."¹ And since not all scientific labour is materialised labour, no sign of equality can be put between them.

"Cooperative labour... is the direct cooperation of individuals."² As regards living labour, it presupposes the carrying over of the results of past labour to the new product created by it. Understandably, not every "direct cooperation of individuals" performs the functions of living labour. Hence, in this instance these concepts are not synonymous either.

The artificial creation of such confusion in the well-ordered system of Marx's categories serves the same aim of "transforming" past labour into living labour.

The fact that most of the scientists who have ever lived on earth live and work in our time testifies not to the extinguishment of the concept of "living labour," but to the greatly increased importance of science in production. In the conditions of the scientific and technological revolution scientists employed in research and educational institutions and laboratories play a very prominent role in production. In Marx's time this productive force was personified in individuals of genius; in our time a large-scale socialisation of science itself has taken place, for a scientist's labour is now unthinkable outside of laboratories and institutes, that is, without the cooperation and assistance of a vast body of other scientific workers.

However, this fact of the increased role of science in production does not at all signify that the very process of production of commodities has

¹ *Capital*, Vol. 3, p. 103.

² *Ibid.*

been disrupted. Just as in Marx's time, today the product passes through the stages of research, development and production. This sequence of stages, from a scientific conception to its realisation in practice, does not depend on whether or not the scientific ideas of contemporary scientists or those of past generations have been used in the process.

In replacing the working class by the intelligentsia as the most revolutionary force, the present-day revisionists are also opposing the working class to the future members of the intelligentsia, the students. Garaudy in fact condemns the students' urge to rally round the working class, and calls on them to take independent revolutionary action. In an interview with *Der Spiegel*, he said of the student actions in France in May, 1968, that "the students... sought to establish an alliance with the workers and arranged for reports to be made to them at factory gates instead of mounting an autonomous, really revolutionary and powerful student movement at their universities."¹ He also took this attitude towards students in his earlier "theoretical studies," when he accorded equal rights to the workers' movement and the student movement and argued that they were "motive factors of a single whole."²

Garaudy's stand conflicts with the views of Marxism-Leninism on students and the student movement. Students are a social category formed from all classes and strata of society. Accordingly, they vary in their political aspirations. Garaudy lumps together the purposeful working-class struggle against the capitalist system and the often

¹ *Der Spiegel*, 1971, Nr. 20, S. 120.

² *The Whole Truth*, p. 42.

spontaneous and politically diffuse student movement, and rejects the idea that the working class should influence and guide it. This is not just a misconception. He ascribes to the students (the intelligentsia of the future) the same role in the "new historical bloc" as the working class, believing as he does that the intelligentsia is the driving force of that bloc.

In the last decade, students have been playing a much greater role in the life of society. With the growth of the scientific and technological revolution their numerical strength has increased dramatically. In France their number rose from 160,000 in 1961 to 640,000 in 1969. There was a decrease in the proportion of students from the privileged classes.

Students have expressed great dissatisfaction with the system of education and with their unfavourable living conditions. In 1969, for instance, 40 per cent of French students worked a full working day to pay for their education. The main concern of students, however, is about their employment prospects. The declining position of the intelligentsia makes them uncertain of their own future. The influx of young persons from the middle strata and the working class has helped to revolutionise the students. The number of students from working-class families is still not large (in 1969, they accounted for only 9.9 per cent of French students), but it is on the increase. Student unrest, therefore, has many causes.

The adventuristic "New Left" groups often capitalise on the students' revolutionary enthusiasm and present them with nonsensical "action" programmes, and student unrest sometimes has no specific purpose at all. Student activity varies widely. It ranges from demonstrations against impe-

rialist military aggression, racial discrimination and the infringement of the rights of nations, to calls for increased student grants, the provision of hostels, the enlargement of libraries and lecture-halls, etc.

This shows the need for the working class and its parties to guide the student movement. Seeking to carry favour with the students and to set them against the workers' movement, the revisionists advance the notion that the student movement and the workers' movement are equal in importance. They thus try to deal a blow at the unity of the anti-imperialist front.

Garaudy does not assign to the middle strata (largely farmers and craftsmen) any part in the revolutionary struggle, maintaining that the peasantry is rapidly diminishing as a class and is of no significance for the future. Accordingly, he says that the working class, or rather the "new historical bloc", should establish no more than tactical alliances with the peasantry.

Admittedly, capitalist competition has created a very difficult situation for the farmers. In 1954, the traditional middle strata and the farmers in France accounted for over one-third of the gainfully employed population, while now they account for only about 20 per cent. However, even in advanced capitalist countries, such as France and Italy, the farmers remain an important social and revolutionary force. Strong farmer actions in France, Italy and Belgium in 1971 against the Common Market's agricultural policy demonstrated the revolutionary potential of this section of society. Consequently, Garaudy's call for a weakening of the traditional alliance between the working class and the farmers is nothing more than a call for weakening the alliance with a loyal and

tested partner in the revolutionary struggle and for the artificial narrowing of the social base of the anti-imperialist front.

The need for joint action by all those opposed to monopoly capital is dictated by both the immediate interests of the working class and the requirements of the anti-imperialist struggle at the present stage, and by the fact that only in constant joint struggle is forged unity of action of the working class and all the working strata of bourgeois society. In their political declaration adopted at a conference held in Brussels in January 1974 the Communist and workers' parties of the capitalist countries of Europe noted: "The greatest difficulties fall directly on the working class, on the millions of over-exploited immigrant workers, on the peasants and the middle classes in general, as well as on the small and medium-sized firms who suffer the consequences of monopoly concentration. There is increasing dissatisfaction among white-collar workers and intellectuals, engineers, technicians, teachers and students."¹ Unity of action of all the classes and strata of bourgeois society oppressed by capitalism creates the conditions for a victorious joint struggle against imperialism to secure peace, democracy and socialism.

In the arguments they advance the revisionists deliberately split up the contemporary working class in the advanced capitalist countries. It does not exist for them as a single body consisting of urban and rural workers, builders, workers in the transport and service fields, unskilled, semi-skilled

¹ *Comment* (London), March 9, 1974.

and highly skilled workers (some of whom have been trained as engineers and technicians), men and women and workers of various nationalities, who, regardless of such distinctions, are all oppressed by capitalism (though to somewhat varying degrees), and who form the main revolutionary force opposing the bourgeoisie today.

The revisionists completely disregard the part which the overwhelming majority of workers are playing in the revolutionary struggle. They argue that it is only those groups of skilled workers closest to the intelligentsia who are playing a revolutionary role. They make use of this argument to stress again *the leading role of the intelligentsia*. This is a complete departure from Marxism, a crude and unscientific revision, which utterly distorts the actual relationship between the working class and the intelligentsia in capitalist society.

"Diluting" the working class with the intelligentsia and giving the latter preference in his artificially constructed "new historical bloc," Garaudy counterposes this bloc to the anti-monopoly, democratic struggle of the working people in advanced capitalist countries. He writes: "The bearer of the revolutionary future of the nation—the new historical bloc—cannot be identified with the 'anti-monopoly alliance' upon the establishment of which some opposition parties, for instance, base their strategy and programme... The concept of the 'new historical bloc' is directly opposed to the concept of an 'anti-monopoly alliance'... What is involved is no longer a compromise between parties or heterogeneous strata of society in the name of establishing an electoral coalition, parliamentary union or coalition government. What is involved is determining what for-

ces are potentially capable of accomplishing the historical change.”¹

Thus, by ignoring the anti-monopoly, anti-imperialist attitude of such classes and strata of bourgeois society as the farmers and the middle urban strata, Garaudy virtually denies the possibility and necessity of alliance with them in the fight for social progress.

To be sure, the unification of all the anti-monopoly forces under the leadership of the revolutionary working class and their struggle against imperialism do not yet signify a direct struggle against the existing system in order to establish socialism. The anti-monopoly, general democratic struggle is a stage, and an extremely important and necessary one, which paves the way for the struggle of the working people for fundamental social change.

In justification of his frankly negative attitude towards the anti-monopoly alliance, Garaudy declares that it is dishonest to promise the farm worker and the urban petty bourgeoisie “patches of land and small shops” in order to win them over. However, the “fair-dealing and fair-speaking” Garaudy is himself dishonest in his argumentation. The Communist parties have never resorted to such primitive promises in calling upon all working people oppressed by monopoly capital to rally around the working class for the sake of winning elementary democratic freedoms. They have always advanced their own programmes, taking realistic stock of the socio-economic situation, and clearly determined the place of these classes and strata of working people in socialist society. At

¹ *L'Alternative*, pp. 174, 177.

the same time the Communist parties resolutely oppose capitalist "methods" of abolishing these social groups who are faced with the prospect of ruin and a bleak future—a prospect which objectively induces them to adopt an anti-monopoly stance and join in the general democratic, anti-monopoly movement. The role and place of these classes and strata in the future socialist society will be determined, of course, by the new social relations.

Garaudy declares that "the central slogan of the unification of the forces that are the bearers of the future will not be an anti-monopoly alliance built through compromises between political headquarters,"¹ which is tantamount to weakening the anti-monopoly alliance of the working people. Under cover of revolutionary verbiage he seeks in fact to narrow the social base of the general democratic struggle in the face of the class enemy which is increasingly consolidating its ranks.

The whole course of events as they are actually taking place makes nonsense of Garaudy's "advice." As was stressed at the 1969 International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties in Moscow, "In the course of anti-monopolist and anti-imperialist united action, favourable conditions are created for uniting all democratic trends into a political alliance capable of decisively limiting the role played by the monopolies in the economies of the countries concerned, of putting an end to the power of big capital and of bringing about such radical political and economic changes as would ensure the most favourable conditions for continuing the struggle for socialism. The main

¹ *L'Alternative*, p. 195.

force in this democratic alliance is the working class.”¹

The concept of the “new historical bloc” is from beginning to end a renunciation of the Marxist-Leninist theory on the classes in capitalist society and the driving forces of the socialist revolution. It is harmful to the international Communist and working-class movement because under cover of Marxist phraseology Garaudy twists the facts of the contemporary development of capitalist society in such a way as to present the driving forces of revolution as an amorphous mass, which, while being anti-monopolistic, does not pursue the clear-cut aims of a socialist revolution.

This concept virtually denies the leading role of the working class in the world revolutionary movement. In place of the working class it substitutes a bloc in which the working class plays only a minor part, since the intelligentsia and potential intelligentsia, the students, are proclaimed to be the leading force of this bloc. Garaudy thus glosses over the main antagonism, that between the bourgeoisie and its natural class enemy, the working class, and reduces the intensity of the confrontation between them.

The “new historical bloc” concept rejects the Marxist-Leninist approach of establishing alliances between the working class and other anti-monopoly forces in capitalist society. Instead, Garaudy proposes a “bloc” policy which dissolves the role of the working class in the revolutionary movement. In its report to the 19th Congress of the French Communist Party, the Central Committee said that “the working class has no inten-

¹ *International Meeting*, p. 27.

tion of renouncing an alliance with all the social strata which are experiencing the ill effects of the policy of big business.”¹

Garaudy apparently realises that his concept of the “new historical bloc” consisting of such different social forces as the working class and the intelligentsia is contradictory and not very convincing. He therefore “finds” in the working class a “nexus” that holds the “bloc” together, thus showing the social roots of his revised “Marxism-Leninism.” He contends that this nexus consists of a highly skilled section of workers who, by reason of changes that have come about in the actual definition of skill, find themselves in very close proximity to the technologists, the cadres and the engineers. Even if this category of workers is not yet numerically predominant at the present stage it constitutes the strategical level decisive in cementing the new “historical bloc.”²

Contrary to what Garaudy says, highly skilled workers at present make up a fairly substantial part of the working class. But they are by no means a homogeneous group because they do not occupy identical material and social positions and accordingly do not pursue a common political goal in the struggle against the existing order. Most of the highly skilled workers form the vanguard of the working class in the anti-imperialist struggle, but others (and here Garaudy is correct in saying that they are not numerous) are the accomplices of the bourgeoisie inside the workers’ movement; these others not only “find themselves in very close proximity... to the administra-

¹ *Cahiers du communisme*, 1970, N. 2-3, p. 52.

² *The Turning-Point of Socialism*, p. 200.

tors..." but are their direct agents. No matter what new formulas Garaudy may think up, this section of the working class has long been known in the workers' movement and by scientific socialism as the "labour aristocracy," "bourgeoisified workers," "yes-men of capitalism."

Under the impact of the scientific and technological revolution the "labour aristocracy" has naturally changed. But it has not disappeared, and the revisionists continue to capitalise on it. Their concepts of "democratic," "humane" and other types of "socialism" (which Garaudy supports) express the interests of the bourgeois intelligentsia and the "labour aristocracy," which arose mainly out of the development of monopoly capitalism and not out of a change in the concept of "skill." The social policy of this section is called opportunism.

What monopoly capitalism is really trying to do in each country is to "integrate" the working class and the majority of the working people in the system of state-monopoly capitalism and persuade them to act in its interests, thereby consolidating monopoly rule. The concept of the "new historical bloc," which objectively serves this aim of capitalism, was condemned at the 19th Congress of the French Communist Party. In its report to the congress, the FCP Central Committee stated: "It is incorrect to employ the term 'new historical bloc' in this context. This term implies, in effect, that the intelligentsia and the working class constitute an integral whole. But, on the one hand, this by no means conforms to the reality, and will not do so for a long time to come; and on the other, one ends up by reducing the working class to a motley mass and casting doubt on

its decisive role, that of vanguard in the struggle for the transformation of society.”¹

In these concepts one can see an effort to mix various non-Marxist tenets with Marxist ones wrung out of their context. Garaudy is merely flirting with the idea of revolution when he says that the mission of the Communist party is to “embody the revolutionary plan,”² and when he tells us that one of the main themes of his “Turning-Point” is “how is revolution possible in a highly developed country?”³ Fischer also speculates on the question of revolution in his “Die Revolution ist anders.” Essentially, everything that the revisionists have to say about the revolution is designed to discredit the Marxist-Leninist teaching on the revolution. They are thus objectively working against the development of the revolutionary processes in the world.

In their approach to present-day problems of the socialist revolution, the revisionists combine abstract statements on the inhuman nature of capitalism with a technocratic interpretation of the crucial questions of the revolution.

Fischer writes that he never regarded revolution as a subject for conscious thought, that it is always “an impulse,” a “feeling.” No wonder he calls himself a “recalcitrant individualist” and a “dissident in the spiritual field,” and holds that his views have not changed from those he held in 1929, when he said: “. . . Our socialism was not knowledge, not a clarity of aim nor class consciousness. It was only a feeling; it was passion combined

¹ *Cahiers du communisme*, 1970, N. 2-3 pp. 51-52.

² *The Turning-Point of Socialism*, p. 8.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 39.

with desperate zeal, with radical hatred and radical love.”¹

It is very obvious that the revisionists are trying to avoid giving a definition of the character of revolution in the contemporary world. They deal with “revolution” in general, and not with a socialist, anti-capitalist, anti-exploitation revolution, nor a national liberation revolution (whose social importance is growing). They do not always specify the aims of their revolution, which class (or classes) is (or are) its driving force, what production relations it seeks to abolish, the nature of the state that is to be established as a result of it, etc. The historically necessary, law-governed process in which the capitalist (or pre-capitalist) production relations are superseded by socialist ones, is discussed in abstract terms as “evolution,” “reforms,” “change,” “remodelling,” “revolution,” etc. The modern revisionists’ departure from class positions in defining the nature of revolution results in their virtually equating the capitalist and socialist systems.

The revisionists increasingly incline towards a technocratic interpretation of revolutionary processes in a spirit of openly bourgeois vindication of capitalism. They believe that the need for the socialist transformation of society is the *automatic outcome of scientific and technological change*, and that it *does not arise from the social contradictions* of the capitalist socio-economic system.

Garaudy says that “the new scientific and technological revolution demands in return the most radical revolution in human history.”² But the socialist revolution (and not a “radical” one in gene-

¹ Ernst Fischer, *Erinnerungen und Reflexionen*, S. 10.

² *The Turning-Point of Socialism*, p. 43.

ral) arises primarily from the aggravation of the socio-economic contradictions of the capitalist system during the scientific and technological revolution, and not from scientific and technological progress as such. "Among students, cadres and workers alike," says Garaudy, "what is forcibly emerging in opposition to the blind mechanism of industrial civilisation is human *subjectivity* in this era of the scientific and technological revolution."¹ This is what Garaudy sees as the source of the various revolutionary movements. He thus argues that it is not the intensification of capitalist exploitation and monopolist oppression in the context of the scientific and technological revolution that gives rise to revolutionary movements but "the blind mechanism of industrial civilisation."

In his recent anti-Marxist publications Fischer, too, leans towards the technocratic theory. In his earlier works he called for the "spiritual freedom" of the individual and the overcoming of the "self-alienation of the person." But now his approach to revolution is overwhelmingly technocratic. According to Fischer, the tasks of a revolution largely amount to the reasonable, "humanistic" use of advanced productive forces. He says that the intelligentsia alone can head the revolutionary movement, and instead of methods of revolutionary struggle he proposes cautious, reformist action designed to force employers into making partial concessions. Instead of analysing the crucial question of power and the alignment of classes, strata and groups in the struggle for power, he rhetorically asks who is to win what.

¹ *The Turning-Point of Socialism*, p. 19.

Fischer deduces the socialist revolution from scientific and technological progress and claims that the present epoch is not a revolutionary epoch of transition from capitalism to socialism which began with the Great October Socialist Revolution. According to him the "long epoch of social revolution" did not begin at the end of the First World War as a result of the October Revolution, which broke the weakest link in the imperialist chain; instead he contends that it was the outcome of the "unusual development of productive forces in the era of the 'scientific and technological revolution'." ¹

He makes a fetish of scientific and technological change and this leads him to the groundless and erroneous conclusion that the world social revolution is now "very different from the way Marx and Lenin envisaged it." ²

The revisionists' concept of the "viability" of contemporary capitalism is unscientific, because it is not based on an analysis of the social aspects of scientific and technological progress in the capitalist countries. They gloss over the social changes in capitalist society and virtually deny that it is historically doomed.

Fischer, stressing the "stability" of capitalism, points to the rapid development of the productive forces and the growth of labour productivity and the increase in the national product under capitalism. "So here is not a sick, not a dying but a viable capitalism." ³ But he takes no account of such diseases of the capitalist economy as manifested by the cyclic nature of production, the chro-

¹ *Wiener Tagebuch*, 1970, Nr. 1/2, S. 5.

² *Der Spiegel*, 1969, Nr. 47, S. 149.

³ *Die Revolution ist anders*, S. 66.

nic underemployment of production facilities, social antagonisms, etc.

In the view of the revisionists revolutionary changes cannot take place in highly developed capitalist states, those citadels of imperialism. Fischer says: "On the whole... in contemporary industrial society it is unlikely for a revolution to occur that could be victorious at one stroke and consolidate victory by establishing a dictatorship."¹ And Garaudy writes: "In the present state of American economic development, can it reasonably be supposed that socialism will prevail in the United States as a result of some apocalyptic situation in which the working class will be driven by misery to a rebellion?"²

The revisionists deny the existence of any fundamental social antagonism (between capital and labour, the bourgeoisie and the proletariat) in capitalist society that could give rise to class struggle and a socialist revolution. Instead they talk of technocratic contradictions, which, they believe, can be settled by reforms and without revolution. Fischer writes: "I think that the contradiction represented by the abuse and squandering of productive forces on the one hand, and everything created by contemporary science, technology and labour on the other, will increasingly turn into a social force. I see the main antagonism in this, and not only in the contradiction between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie."³

The revisionists have therefore repudiated basic Marxist-Leninist tenets on classes and the class struggle. They fail to understand the main tasks

¹ *Die Revolution ist anders*, S. 42.

² *The Turning-Point of Socialism*, pp. 51-52.

³ *Der Spiegel*, 1969, Nr. 47, S. 149.

of the world revolutionary process, they call for reforms and not for revolution, because they assess capitalist reality from a technocratic position and are virtually reconciled with capitalism.

Garaudy proposes that his programme (which is a typical example of reformism) should be used to solve the basic problems of US society, that is, to improve the capitalist system without changing its basis. He states: "This programme is feasible without undermining the principles and the fundamental laws of the regime. It would, on the contrary, make them fully effective, by preserving, regenerating and giving reality to those traditions that have contributed to the greatness of the United States; this does not spell socialism, but a purposeful capitalism. But it is perhaps the only way to bring about a profound regeneration and to open up the prospect of a creative future for the United States and for the world."¹

As we can see, for Garaudy "the only way" of remaking US society lies not in the revolutionary sweeping away of the old social system, but in "regenerating" the exploitative system which, in the opinion of the "revolutionary" Garaudy, is responsible for "the greatness of the United States."

Garaudy's approach to the workers' movement in other advanced capitalist countries is much the same. He does not contend that the socialist revolution must be carried out and that the dictatorship of the proletariat must be established in a "country with a developed economy and technology, a high cultural standard, a skilled, educated working class and democratic bourgeois traditions." Instead, he argues that favourable conditions should be created for "socialist penetration

¹ *The Turning-Point of Socialism*, p. 76.

and for the acceptance of the mutations stemming from the new scientific and technological revolution.”¹

Garaudy's reformist interpretation of the social movement in capitalist countries leads him to the preachment of the bourgeois theory of “convergence,” according to which the capitalist and socialist countries can be brought closer together on the basis of partial changes in the former and the present development in the latter. It is from this position that he has the following to say on the prospects for world development: “What can be done here and now is to press, in the United States, for a form of capitalism that has human goals; in the Soviet Union for the democratisation of socialism and, in the Third World for the discovery of new criteria and new methods of development.”²

Fischer, too, repeatedly states that capitalism can be transformed in an evolutionary, reformist way. He showed clearly his position in an interview with *Der Spiegel*, when he said: “I would not polarise reforms and revolution. I see the world revolution as a series of large and small reforms.”³

Thus the revisionists seek to divert the revolutionary movement into channels where it will have least effect on the political power of capital. Such a “revolution” will not resolve but seek to *reconcile class contradictions*.

The question of power and the dictatorship of the proletariat is the crucial question of the socialist revolution, which begins with the seizure

¹ *The Turning-Point of Socialism*, p. 187.

² *Ibid.*, p. 249.

³ *Der Spiegel*, 1969, Nr. 47, S. 150.

of power. This power is used as the main instrument of economic, social and cultural transformations. But Garaudy goes out of his way to belittle the importance of the political struggle and argues that in the past "the emphasis has always been laid on the chronological and hierarchical priority of the political struggle. This may have been necessary in countries that were, at the start, economically and technologically backward or where there was no bourgeois democratic tradition. Such is not the case in highly developed countries." ¹

When reading the works of the revisionists one gets the impression that the power of capital no longer exists, that this power has become extremely "complex" and has virtually "disappeared" and that there is no point in the workers fighting for it. Fischer writes: "Power has become more concentrated and more complex, and its intensification or moderation depends on many factors. Calls for the 'seizure of all power' have almost become a metaphor. Who seizes what? Who conquers whom?" ² He misinterprets the alignment of forces in contemporary capitalist society, where the state machinery, the bourgeois parties and the mass media serve the interests of the capitalists and are certainly not "parallel," autonomous vehicles of power.

Under various pretexts the revisionists strongly oppose the dictatorship of the proletariat. They argue that in socialist society a "dictatorship of the party" has been established. According to Garaudy, it does not follow from Marxist principles that "the dictatorship of the proletariat must of necessity be exercised through the Communist

¹ *The Turning-Point of Socialism*, p. 212.

² *Die Revolution ist anders*, S. 42.

Party.”¹ But Lenin often stated that the dictatorship of the proletariat must be exercised primarily through the Communist party. Experience has shown that even under a multi-party system there is a need for a Marxist-Leninist party to guide society.

The Communist Party is the vanguard and the most politically conscious, most organised and most united part of the working class. It is only with the help of the party that the workers can exercise their dictatorship over the overthrown exploiting classes and engage in creative and educational activities. The revisionists are obviously attacking the so-called “dictatorship of the party” in order to emasculate the revolutionary content of the dictatorship of the proletariat, render the working class leaderless and prevent its most politically conscious and militant part from guiding the development of the revolutionary process. In this respect, the revisionists adopt the position of the counter-revolutionaries who advanced the slogan: “For the Soviets, but without the Communists!” during the first years of Soviet power. But the working class and the entire Soviet people rejected this call and entrusted their Communist Party with the task of guiding the revolution.

The revisionists also argue that the dictatorship of the proletariat inevitably limits democracy. Fischer writes: “The demand for a dictatorship, whether it be the dictatorship of the proletariat, the dictatorship of education or whatever, promotes dictatorial trends and paralyses democratic trends.”² He thus opposes the abstract concept of “dictatorship” to the concept of “democra-

¹ *The Turning-Point of Socialism*, p. 79.

² *Die Revolution ist anders*, S. 43.

cy" in general; in other words, he is using the ammunition of the bourgeois ideologists. Like them, he ignores the fact that the great majority of the working people do enjoy the widest democratic rights under the dictatorship of the proletariat: administrative and government bodies are in the hands of the working people, who enjoy freedom of speech, freedom of the press, freedom of assembly, etc.

Historical experience has shown that the overthrown exploiting classes do not voluntarily leave the social scene, but try to regain power and depose the working people's government even after the socialist revolution. In this, they are zealously aided by international capitalism. Therefore it is only some form of dictatorship of the proletariat that can defend the gains of the working people. Lenin observed that "No revolution is worth anything unless it can defend itself."¹ But the revisionists do not accept this. Fischer says that a "dictatorship is not needed for the defence of what has been achieved."² He thus proposes that the victorious people should be left defenceless in the face of their international and external enemies.

The revisionists, who have now gone as far as renouncing the principles of scientific communism, deny that the working class has a historical mission to fulfil, and that there is any need for a socialist revolution or some form of dictatorship of the proletariat. Instead they advocate reformism, i.e., the evolutionary "transformation" of capitalism into socialism.

¹ Lenin, *Coll. Works*, Vol. 28, p. 124.

² *Die Revolution ist anders*, S. 48.

II. Social Relations under Socialism and Revisionist Falsifications

The revisionists not only take an anti-Marxist stand in discussing the social processes in capitalist society and the problems of the revolutionary struggle of the working class and its allies against capitalism; they also distort the Marxist-Leninist theory and practice of the new, socialist system created by the working people.

The ways of carrying out a socialist revolution and building socialism, and hence the socio-economic and political forms of socialist society, may differ from country to country. This is due to differences in socio-economic conditions arising from historical, geographical, national and international factors. Lenin wrote: "All nations will arrive at socialism—this is inevitable, but all will do so in not exactly the same way, each will contribute something of its own to some form of democracy, to some variety of the dictatorship of the proletariat, to the varying rate of socialist transformations in the different aspects of social life."¹

It is a Marxist-Leninist postulate that the society replacing capitalism will be established in a variety of forms—a view which has been borne out by historical experience. Socialism as it exists to-

¹ Lenin, *Coll. Works*, Vol. 23, pp. 69-70.

day exhibits specific features, differences and distinctions in the various socialist countries of the world. When Marxists speak of the variety of the forms of socialism, they have in mind the many diverse forms in which, owing to the specific historical development of a particular country, the essential features of socialism and the general laws of its development manifest themselves.

Unlike Marxists, the revisionists in discussing their "plurality of models of socialism," have in mind a diversity of essences of socialism (and not its forms), although they try to conceal this.

What arguments does Garaudy produce to substantiate his concept of the "plurality of models of socialism"?

His line of reasoning boils down to the following. If socialism had a stable essence, the differences between the socialist countries would concern only the forms or ways of building socialism. But since, in his view, socialism is not a phase of a new socio-economic formation but a "form of transition from capitalism to communism," it retains numerous vestiges of the old society, and accordingly the differences between the socialist countries are differences of substance and not detail. Garaudy maintains that the question is one of "fundamental distinctions," i.e., distinctions that concern the essence of the new society and which are embodied in fundamentally differing "models of socialism."¹

Garaudy thus regards socialism as a "transitional system"² between the capitalist and communist formations. And it is on this basis that he

¹ *Le Testament de Varga*. Préface de Roger Garaudy, Paris, 1970, p. 18; *La Tribune de Genève*, 4.9, 1970.

² *Pour un modèle français du socialisme*, p. 108.

builds his concept of the "plurality of models of socialism." However, Marxism-Leninism regards socialism not as a transitional system, but as the first phase of the communist formation, holding that between capitalism and socialism as the first phase of communism there is indeed a transitional period, during which the former undergoes a revolutionary transformation into the latter.

Marx in "Critique of the Gotha Programme" and Lenin in "The State and Revolution" clearly show the consistent historical pattern of the various stages of the struggle for communism: first, the special stage of transition from capitalism to socialism (the "prolonged birth pangs"); next, the first phase of communist society (socialism); and, finally, the higher phase of communist society (communism proper). According to Marxism-Leninism, during the transitional period various socio-economic structures and exploiting classes continue to exist, against which the victorious proletariat and its allies wage a class struggle. The main historical task of the transitional period is the laying of the foundations of socialist society. This task is accomplished through the overcoming of the antagonistic contradiction represented by the continued existence of various formations of the old, capitalist society within growing socialism.

By the end of the transitional period the economy is transformed to a socialist economy and the vestiges of the exploiting classes are eliminated. The first phase of communism, i.e., socialism, is characterised by the absolute supremacy of socialist property and socialist production relations, the existence of only socialist classes and strata, the absence of social distinctions between town and country and between intellectual and manual

work, the development of socialist democracy and socialist culture, and so on.¹

Despite the inventions of the revisionists, socialism is not some amorphous "transitional-state" society devoid of a stable essence. Socialism as the first phase of the communist formation develops on a new socio-economic basis, features of which are of a universal, international character. Just as the different capitalist countries—the highly industrialised ones, those at an intermediate stage of development, and backward countries—have social relations of the same (capitalist) type, so the socialist countries have common features determined by the essence of the first phase of the communist formation, that is, socialism.

"...When we speak of the main features of *socialism that has been built*, this question is likewise clear to Communists," Leonid Brezhnev said in his Lenin Centenary address. "It is clear to us today not only from the theoretical propositions

¹ The Maoists, too, ignore these facts. They declare, for instance, that during the historical stage of socialism there still exist antagonistic class contradictions and class struggle, that there is a constant danger of the restoration of capitalism, and that the central question of "who will beat whom" can be decided only as a result of the attainment of the ultimate aims of socialism. These are erroneous propositions, because their authors ignore the fundamental qualitative changes that take place in social development with the establishment of the foundations of socialism, and fail to understand that contradictions of the socialist social system are contradictions of a new, non-antagonistic type, elements of which already manifested themselves in the transitional period. They arbitrarily transpose the laws of the transitional period which is marked by the existence of and struggle between the vanquished but not destroyed capitalism and the new and growing socialism, to socialist society, which is already functioning and developing as an integral social organism with a socialist basis and a superstructure conforming to it.

of Marxist teaching but also from the experience of development gained by the socialist countries. What are these features? They are the power of the working people with the vanguard role exercised by the working class and the leadership of social development provided by the Marxist-Leninist party; public ownership of the means of production and, on its basis, the planned development of the national economy on the highest technological level for the benefit of the whole people; the implementation of the principle 'from each according to his ability, to each according to his work'; the education of the whole people in the spirit of the ideology of scientific communism, in a spirit of friendship with the peoples of the fraternal socialist countries and the working people of the whole world; and lastly, a foreign policy founded on the principles of proletarian, socialist internationalism.

"All these general, basic elements of socialism are of decisive significance."¹

Thus, the attempts by Garaudy and other revisionists to "substantiate" the possibility of there being fundamentally different "models of socialism" by depicting socialism as a "transitional system" are futile on both theoretical and practical grounds. Nor is Garaudy's argumentation tenable in the case of the period of transition from capitalism to socialism, because, as may be seen from his reasoning, he ignores the general laws of the building of socialist society. It has been made abundantly clear not only in theory but also in practice that success in building the new society is in great measure dependent upon a cor-

¹ L. I. Brezhnev, *Lenin's Cause Lives on and Triumphs*, Moscow, 1970, pp. 61-62.

rect combination of the universal and the nationally specific in social development. Moreover, the way to socialism, and the main features of this way are determined first and foremost by the general laws applicable to the development of all socialist countries.

The heritage of the past, expressed in the level of development of the productive forces, and cultural and other traditions, etc., naturally influences the course of the building of socialism in each country. But, as experience shows, it influences the specific forms of the socialist organisation of society and does not affect the essence of socialism. Socialist construction therefore proceeds in different forms, taking into account the concrete historical conditions and the prerequisites that were created in the past, but it can lead to the ultimate goal only when it is carried out on the basis of the general law-governed features of the emergence and development of socialism stemming from its essence. Hence the unity of the entire complex process of socialist transformation in different countries, despite the revisionists with their concept of the "plurality of models of socialism".

It is important to note that the countries of the world socialist system are at different stages of development of socialism. But if the socialist countries still differ in the degree of the maturity of their socialism, and are in different periods and stages of socialist development, this in no way signifies that each of them has some fundamentally different kind of socialism, a specific "model" of it.

Together with the anti-communists, who, with the object of splitting the world socialist system, produced the notorious doctrine of "national communism", Right revisionists often hold forth on

European, Asian, African, etc., "socialism", and on Soviet, Czechoslovak, French and other alternative "models" of socialism. In doing so they absolutise both certain nationally specific features of individual countries (most often old, obsolete national traditions), and individual but historically transient methods and forms of socialist construction, in an attempt to capitalise on any deficiencies that may become apparent in the construction of the new society.

The renegades specially single out for a vicious attack the "Soviet model of socialism", which they depict as a nationally specific, narrowly local, purely "Russian" phenomenon which is a far cry from Marxism. In this instance the revisionists openly challenge Lenin's well-known propositions to the effect that the Russian model offers to all peoples "something highly significant"¹ which they will not be able to do without, and that the building of socialism follows a number of general laws which are common to all countries.

Thus the revisionist concepts of "models of socialism" depend on a distortion of the scientific understanding of the single nature of the socialist socio-economic organism. Such distortion takes two principal directions. The exponents of one of them subject socialism to a pluralistic interpretation from an openly revisionist position and replace it with unscientific concepts of "national socialism" through adding various non-socialist features to the essence of socialism. Others hold that "models of socialism" are the different ways and methods by which the transition to socialism is achieved.

¹ Lenin, *Coll. Works*, Vol. 31, p. 22

The renegade W. Leonhard writes in his book "The Triple Splitting of Marxism" that the "modelling" of socialism is expressed in the various concepts of "humane socialism", "pluralistic socialism", "democratic socialism", "socialism with a human face", etc. As the author himself frankly admits, all these concepts are aimed first and foremost against the Soviet experience in socialist construction. The rejection of the "Soviet model" is accompanied by attempts "not only to find new ways to socialism, but above all to develop new models of socialist society."¹

The "models of socialism" proposed by revisionist theoreticians are numerous indeed. However, a closer look at their basic features reveals that they all boil down to a common "model", anti-communist in its essence, which the revisionists peddle in opposition to the socialism that exists and the theory of scientific communism.

The primary difference between such a "socialism" and socialism as it actually exists is in the *economic basis*. The inventors of "new socialism" hold that the socialist state ownership of the means of production that prevails in all the socialist countries gives rise to bureaucracy, limits democracy and leads to the deformation of socialism. They reject socialist state property and propose instead "social property administered . . . by the entire body of direct producers and workers."²

In connection with this understanding of socialist property the theoreticians of the revisionist Right devote special attention to the status of la-

¹ W. Leonhard, *Die Dreispaltung des Marxismus*, Düsseldorf-Wien, 1970, S. 335, 336, 393.

² *The Turning-Point of Socialism*, p. 153.

bour associations under socialism.¹ Leonhard puts it to the revisionists' credit that they have "revived" a "central point" of the theory of the founders of Marxism on communist society—the idea of "associations of free producers". However, this idea, just as Marx's proposition that even in its first phase communist society will already be based on the principles of collectivism, is interpreted by the revisionists of the Right in an anarchosindicalist spirit, with the separateness of working collectives being made into an absolute to the detriment of the common interests of society.

Marx and Engels pointed out repeatedly in their works that the associations of producers they had in mind were such as would exist and act in conditions of the socialisation and centralisation of the means of production on a national scale. Marx wrote that the *national centralisation of the means of production* would become the national basis of society consisting of an association of free and equal producers engaged in social labour according to a common and rational plan. The *Manifesto of the Communist Party* states: "The proletariat will use its political supremacy to wrest, by degrees, all capital from the bourgeoisie, to centralise all instruments of production in the hands of the State, i.e., of the proletariat organised as the ruling class..."² Engels clearly stated in *Anti-Dühring*: "*The proletariat seizes political power and turns the means of production in the first instance into state property.*"³ In his letter to Au-

¹ *Politique aujourd'hui*, janv.-févr. 1972, pp. 22-27; Osteuropa, 1973, Nr. 7, S. 513, 521; W. Leonhard, *op. cit.*, S. 394-472.

² K. Marx and F. Engels, *Selected Works* in three volumes, Vol. I, Moscow, 1969, p. 126.

³ F. Engels, *Anti-Dühring*, Moscow, 1962, p. 384.

gust Bebel Engels wrote that during the transition to a completely communist economy matters must be arranged so that society—and hence, to begin with, the state—retains ownership of the means of production, and so that the special interests of the cooperative associations do not prevail over the interests of society as a whole. And it is stated directly in the Declaration of Rights of the Working and Exploited People, drafted by Lenin in the first months after the October Revolution in Russia, that all the means of production become the property of the entire working people, i.e., of the workers' and peasants' state.¹

From these propositions of Marxism-Leninism follows the conclusion, now verified in practice, that under socialism it is state property, i.e., the property of all the people and not group property, that constitutes the basis for harmonising individual interests, collective interests and the interests of society as a whole, with priority given to the latter. This is a prime condition for the correct functioning of the entire socialist organism.

Labour associations (working collectives, for instance) of course have a certain independence in socialist society. This is determined by the objective role of an enterprise in the production process and in social life as a whole. Production relations, which constitute the basis of other social relations, are formed directly in working collectives. In these primary labour associations of society the individual is introduced to a most important complex of conditions, which results in his social development. Collectives play an increasing role in socialist society. But it is society that determines the charac-

¹ Lenin, *Coll. Works*, Vol. 26, p. 423.

ter and mode of activity of collectives. The material basis for the primacy of society over any type of association consists first and foremost in the fact that society as a whole, and not any separate part of it, is the subject of socialist public ownership of the basic means of production, which determine socio-economic progress.

The absolute autonomy of "production associations", which is what the theoreticians of Right revisionism virtually advocate, is fraught with the danger of a spontaneous development of society, which in the final analysis harms the interests of the associations themselves and creates obstacles to the realisation of socialist humanist principles. Lenin stressed that "any direct or indirect legalisation of the rights of ownership of the workers of any given factory or any given trade on their particular production... is... a complete rejection of socialism".¹

Thus, the opposition of the theoreticians of the "models of socialism" to socialist state ownership is in conflict with the objective laws of socialism and constitutes a direct revision of Marxism-Leninism.

Echoing the ideologists of capitalism, the revisionists often allege that Communists always and everywhere champion only the state form of socialist property. This is an over-simplification. Firstly, other forms of property, including co-operative and personal property, can and do exist in socialist society. Secondly, the theory of scientific communism provides that the state form of public property exists as long as the state exists. With the withering away of the state during the higher pha-

¹ Lenin, *Coll. Works*, Vol. 42, pp. 100-101.

se of communism it will be transformed, together with the other forms of public property, into single communist property, which will develop and be perfected together with the system of communist public self-government (and not on the basis of self-government interpreted by the revisionists in an anarcho-syndicalist spirit). At the same time Communists are firmly convinced (this conviction stemming from practical experience) of the absolute necessity of state ownership of the means of production during the first phase of communism.

The most active advocates of the revisionist concept of the economic "model of socialism" include Ota Šik, who devotes to this question a central place in a number of books published in recent years and in articles contributed to Western newspapers and magazines. For example, in his voluminous "Third Road" Šik takes great pains to attempt to provide a theoretical basis for the concept of "market socialism" and lays claim to having discovered a "third road" which, in his opinion, will have advantages over both capitalism and "communism".¹

In what does the author see these "advantages"? He sees them in the fact that his "model" of society (as distinct from capitalism) has central "macro-economic" planning which, however (in contradistinction to the socialism that exists), performs only auxiliary functions in economic activity, while the main role is played by the market.²

Separated from the thick verbal chaff surrounding it, the essence of Šik's economic "model" boils

¹ Ota Šik, *Der dritte Weg. Die marxistische-leninistische Theorie und die moderne Industriegesellschaft*, Hamburg, 1972. S. 15.

² *Ibid.*, S. 204, 207, 211.

down to the complete isolation of enterprises from state planning and management, to giving free rein—in conditions of socialism—to competition and the spontaneous play of market forces, and to the pursuit of profit by individual enterprises as the principal aim of activity. The author's claim to the discovery of an original "third road" of social development notwithstanding, his concept bears a clear imprint of the eclectic doctrine of the "convergence" of the two social systems, whose exponents often advocate a mechanical combination of elements of state planning (which is in full measure inherent only in socialism) and market relations of the capitalist type.

Šik's "Third Road" and the writings of other theoreticians of Right revisionism contain slanderous attacks on the scientific principles of party and state guidance of the economic development of socialist society. In the revisionists' view, it is un-socialist to regard the state as the principal instrument of managing the economy of a socialist country. Šik declares that collectivist ownership and centralised state management characterise, not socialism, but a special, "state-monopoly" stage of social development.¹ Similar definitions are to be found in the works of other revisionists.²

Tracing the ideological roots of such a hostile attitude towards the socialist state on the part of these contemporary revisionists of the Right we shall run up against the ideas of Proudhon, Dühring, Bakunin, the Kautskyites and other "old" reformists. They were all to some degree or other

¹ *Der dritte Weg*, S. 415.

² Roger Garaudy, *The Turning-Point of Socialism*; I. Kosta, I. Meyer, S. Weber. *Warenproduktion im Sozialismus*, Frankfurt (Main), 1973.

opposed to centralism, to state control of production in accordance with a single plan in the interests of society as a whole. But real socialism has been built and is developing, not in accordance with, but contrary to the ideas of these authors, on the basis of the theory of scientific communism.

Socialist society constitutes a complex system which can only develop harmoniously given a correct realisation of social interests and the resolution of any non-antagonistic contradictions which may arise with respect to the economic interests of the different social strata, communities and collectives of the society. This calls for an instrument of administration (which in conditions of socialism still has a political character) capable of protecting and furthering first of all the interests (most relevant for the needs of social development) of the most advanced social force, the working class. This instrument is the socialist state, headed by a political force armed with the science of socialism and communism and capable of taking cognizance of and accurately reflecting in its policy the interests of all social groups, eschewing nationalism, parochialism and factionalism. And this force is the Marxist-Leninist party of the working class.

The experience of the USSR and other socialist countries holding to a Marxist-Leninist course has shown that only scientific state management of the economy based on strict observance of the principle of democratic centralism ensures planned, crisis-free development of the economy and steadily rising living standards, and lays a firm material basis for the accomplishment of important social tasks of socialist and communist construction. The all-round organising activity of the socialist state and the leading role of the Marxist-

Leninist party are objectively necessary for the optimal development of a socialist economy.

Only those persons with a petty-bourgeois mentality, who idealise the imaginary independence of the small private proprietor, can conceive of the development of society towards socialism and communism as a chaotic sum-total of the efforts of individual persons or collectives. Socialist society is a highly-organised society created by the systematic labour of millions of people united by a common aim. This aim is formulated by the Marxist-Leninist party, which stands at the head of the people and organises the social forces of society. And it is in this that the leading role of the party is manifested.

Rejecting the need for state planning and administration of the socialist economy, the advocates of "market socialism" would like the national economy to be based on economic relations such that the law of value would determine, fully and virtually without any control, all vital economic processes, including the allocation of capital investments, the size of wages, etc. Is this compatible with genuine socialism, with its objective laws, and specifically with the planned and harmonious development of the economy? There can be only a negative answer.

To be sure, commodity-money relations and market considerations are of great importance for the socialist economic system. But a specific feature of commodity production and the operation of the law of value under socialism is that they are inseparably linked with the planned and proportionate development of the national economy and are determined by this and other fundamental economic principles of socialism. This specific character of commodity-market relations under so-

cialism is ignored by the proponents of "market socialism" and the absolute autonomy of "labour associations".

Thus, the Right-revisionist economic "model of socialism" has nothing in common with the Marxist-Leninist scientific criteria of a socialist economic system. With such a model the economic functions of the socialist state would be undermined, and socialist public ownership deformed in the spirit of a petty-bourgeois interpretation of socialism.

The revisionist concept of a "plurality of models of socialism" deals at length with the *social structure of socialist society*. This is to be expected, since the social structure qualitatively and quantitatively characterises the position of classes, social strata and groups in a particular society and thus makes it possible to determine both the social composition of a society and the laws of its development. Lenin said that without an analysis of the social structure, and clarification of its tendencies, "not a single step can be taken in any sphere of social activity".¹ This explains why, in their efforts to distort the fundamental characteristics of socialism and thereby to impose a fatal strategic policy on communist parties, the modern revisionists attach special importance to theoretical conjectures about the social structure of socialist society.

Historical experience has shown that full social homogeneity does not yet exist even in advanced socialist society. Such a society is a stable alliance of all classes, social strata and groups of the working people in which the working class plays the leading role. As advanced socialist society develops, its social structure moves in the

¹ Lenin. *Coll. Works*, Vol. 17, p. 144.

direction of social homogeneity and the social equality of all its members. These processes are expressed in the gradual elimination of social distinctions between town and country and between intellectual and manual workers. The CPSU Central Committee pointed out in its report to the 24th Party Congress: "The Party's policy is directed towards helping to bring the working class, the collective-farm peasantry and the intelligentsia closer together, and gradually erasing the essential distinctions between town and countryside and between brainwork and manual labour. This is one of the key sectors in the building of a classless communist society."¹

The scientific and technological revolution is playing a crucial part in the solution of the social problems of communist construction. It is only under socialism that full use can be made of its social results in the interests of all members of society. Providing favourable conditions for the development of the scientific and technological revolution, socialist social relations are, in turn, influenced by it. Specifically, by cardinally transforming the means of labour, and influencing the content and character of labour and the everyday life and culture of the people, the scientific and technological revolution acts as a powerful instrument in changing the social structure of society, helping to overcome the remaining social and class distinctions. The Marxist-Leninist parties of the socialist countries, taking account of this influence of the scientific and technological revolution, at the same time strive to direct the processes of development of the social structure in such a way that they accord with the requirements of

¹ *24th Congress of the CPSU*, Moscow, p. 87.

scientific and technological progress and help accelerate it. This is of great importance for combining the achievements of the scientific and technological revolution with the advantages of socialism.

Garaudy, Marek and other revisionists give a simplistic interpretation of the process of the drawing together of classes, social groups and workers by hand and by brain, characterising it as an automatic consequence of the scientific and technological revolution. In fact, this process is much more complex; it is a consequence of material, technological, socio-economic, political, ideological and cultural changes, which are taking place as a result of the activities of the working people under the guidance of the Marxist-Leninist party. These activities help the social system as a whole progress to new, higher stages of communist society.

The tendency for all classes, social strata and groups in developed socialist society to draw together, a tendency that is intensified in the conditions of the scientific and technological revolution, forms the basis of the scientifically formulated social policy of the Marxist-Leninist parties. This policy is aimed at strengthening the alliance of the working class with the farmers, intelligentsia and all working people, in which the working class plays the vanguard role, at further eliminating social distinctions, and at consolidating the friendship, cooperation and unity of all members of socialist society. However, in the absence of objective conditions, any artificial, voluntaristic attempt to accelerate the processes of social integration under socialism, or rely on the spontaneous development of this integration, is harmful to society. The process of the drawing together of social groups will end in the achievement of com-

plete social homogeneity, which will take place at a higher level of maturity of the communist socio-economic formation.

The revisionists as a rule distort the changes occurring in the social structure of socialist society, especially the objective tendencies and prospects of the development of the working class and the socialist intelligentsia. Garaudy fully supported the views of the former revisionist leadership of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia when he said: "Those who have elaborated a humane model of technological civilisation have situated both intellectual and creative work well within the confines of the working class of which it forms one of the most promising components by reason of the new working conditions resulting from the scientific and technological revolution."¹ In his book "The Turning-Point of Socialism," Garaudy says of the Soviet intelligentsia that it too has long ago become "part" of the working class.²

But the differences between the working class and the intelligentsia cannot be swept away by the revisionist recipe of simply declaring that the place of intellectual and creative workers is "within the confines of the working class." Reality refutes the unscientific claim that the socialist intelligentsia has under present conditions become "part" of the working class.

The scientific conception of the intelligentsia as a relatively independent section of socialist society does not imply that it is elevated to the level of some privileged "élite", or that its social im-

¹ *The Whole Truth*, p. 80.

² *Le grand tournant du socialisme*, p. 144.

portance is belittled (as is done by "Leftist" sectarians).

In developed socialist society the intelligentsia as a whole is characterised by internal social unity, a community of ideological and political positions with the working class and other workers. Common interests and aims unite the intelligentsia with the workers of town and countryside in a fraternal alliance of working people, with the leading role being played by the working class. In practice this alliance finds expression in fruitful and many-sided cooperation of the intelligentsia with the working class and agricultural workers in all sectors of communist construction. This unity and cooperation help strengthen the social and political unity of society and serve as an important factor in eliminating socio-class distinctions between people.

The process of the drawing together of the working class and the intelligentsia, which is successfully developing in socialist society, gives rise to so-called border-line groups, which embody the best features of the workers and the intelligentsia. But the qualitative specificity, the social boundaries of the working class, are still not lost. The content of labour changes under the impact of scientific and technological progress, with intellectual operations playing an increasing part in it. There are already groups of workers whose work is primarily non-manual. It has been established that an operator in charge of the production process spends 69 per cent of his working time watching over the technological process, 6 per cent making computations and preparing the programme of work, and only 25 per cent actually operating his machinery. In the case of an automatic machine operator non-manual work accounts for 44.4 per

cent of working time, the rest being spent on labour functions which combine physical and mental labour. Bearing in mind this category of workers (and it is such workers who are in the van of scientific and technological progress), it can be concluded that the noticeable growth of their numerical strength is primarily the result of progressive changes within the socialist working class, specifically those brought about by the scientific and technological revolution. Modern production demands more and more workers with a full secondary education, including specialised education with elements of engineering knowledge.

In such conditions it is natural that the ranks of the workers are being swelled by more and more technicians and engineers. For example, Soviet industry has 700,000 workers' jobs filled by qualified engineers or technicians. Of course, sometimes the employment of qualified personnel as workers is unjustified and is due to inadequate organisation and remuneration of labour. But as a rule it is explained by the requirements of modern automated production. Filling workers' jobs, such qualified personnel begin to play in the system of functional and social division of labour a role that differs qualitatively from the one they played as engineers or technicians. Their social status acquires features similar to basic features of the social position of the working class as a whole, and for this reason they become a contingent of the working class, an organic part of it.

The drawing together of all classes and strata will result, ultimately, not in their mechanical combination, but in a qualitatively new social entity and a new type of worker organically combining in his productive activity physical and mental labour.

Garaudy explicitly includes a part of the intelligentsia in the working class—in both socialist and capitalist societies. His purpose is clearly to displace the working class from its position as the vanguard of the working people. He tries to rob the policy of socialist and communist construction of its class content.

The revisionists sometimes contend that the working class will not grow numerically, and therefore will not be able to play the leading part, unless intellectuals are included in it. But contrary to their assertions, the number of workers in socialist countries is growing fairly rapidly, along with the growth of the socialist economy and scientific and technological progress. The growth of the ranks of the working class is a significant feature of the social development of the countries of the world socialist system. In the past two decades, the numerical strength of the working class has grown by approximately 2.5 times. In 1970 there were more than 110 million members of the working class in the socialist community. The working class accounts for half of all the working people in the member countries of the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance. The proportion of the working class is particularly large—from one-half to three-fifths of all working people—in the USSR, Czechoslovakia, the German Democratic Republic and Hungary.¹

The following factors largely determine the leading role of the working class in socialist society:

First of all, the working class is the main productive force. Its members are engaged chiefly in large-scale industry, which is the basis of the economy, since it produces the principal means of

¹ *World Marxist Review*, No. 2, 1973, pp. 45-46.

production and thus makes possible extended reproduction in all sectors of the economy, including agriculture. The working class naturally plays the leading part in the socialist social organisation of labour, because it is directly connected with producing the means of production and with the scientifically and technologically advanced sectors of the economy. It is the main producer of material wealth, and the driving force of the scientific and technological revolution, and it promotes social development by spreading the most progressive industrial forms of production and labour to all areas of the socialist economy, including agriculture and the servicing sector.

Second, the working class is connected with the most developed form of socialist property—public property. It is the working class in the first instance which seeks to make this most progressive form of property universal (given the objective prerequisites) and to establish single, communist property. The working class promotes the gradual transformation (as the required conditions arise) of socialist cooperative (collective-farm) property into communist property; it actively supports the social advancement of the farm workers and other social groups.

Third, under socialism the working class is the vehicle of the highest forms of political activity and socialist democracy. It takes part in administration not only within the framework of working collectives, but also on a national scale. Among all social groups, the working class (which, as the party of scientific communism, has the highest form of political organisation) is the main stimulator of progress in the political development of socialist society. Its vital class interests determine the main direction of the political development of

socialism—from the consolidation of the state and all-round progress of socialist democracy, to the establishment of communist public self-administration and the withering away of the state.

Fourth, the working class with its Marxist-Leninist ideology is an example of political maturity, of collectivity and of socially conscious attitude towards labour. It is vitally interested in educating all sections of society in the communist principles, since thereby its own great ideals enter the thinking and behaviour of every member of society, leading to the triumph of the Marxist-Leninist outlook.

As socialism advances it gives rise to new features in the working class. The contemporary Soviet working class differs not only from the proletariat of pre-revolutionary days, but also from the working class of the 1930's, when socialism triumphed in the USSR. Its role as the leading economic, social and political force of society has grown. Numerically, it continues to be the largest class in the country. Since the establishment of Soviet power the working class has grown six-fold, and now numbers almost 70 million persons, more than two-thirds of whom are industrial workers. The number of workers with full specialised or general secondary education has increased by more than 30 times since 1939 and at the present time the proportion of such workers is 661 per 1,000.

Addressing the 17th Congress of the Leninist Young Communist League on April 23, 1974, Leonid Brezhnev said: "A production worker of a new type is being moulded in whom physical and mental potentialities are being more and more harmoniously made use of. He is a man with broad professional vision and skill, with a profound knowledge of the polytechnical principles of mo-

dern production, and capable of quickly mastering the latest machines and technology.”¹

The advanced worker of today is knowledgeable and has a broad cultural horizon and a conscientious and creative attitude towards his work. He is also active politically, aware that production is in his hands and that he is responsible for everything that takes place in society.

The further strengthening of the world socialist community, the development of international socialist integration, the growing magnitude of the tasks being tackled in the building and functioning of developed socialism—all this leads to a continual enhancement of the leading role of the working class headed by its Marxist-Leninist party.

Thus, the vital interests of the working class most fully express the objective laws and trends of social development towards the highest phase of communism. Moreover, full communism can be established only when these interests are met. Lenin made the point quite clearly: “Only this class can help the working masses unite, rally their ranks and conclusively defend, conclusively consolidate and conclusively build up a communist society.”²

Ideologically allying themselves with the anti-communists and “New Left” theoreticians of the Marcuse type, the revisionists have been at pains to belittle the historical mission and role of the working class in the socialist countries, to portray it as a “conservative force” incapable of perceiving the progressive trends of social develop-

¹ L. I. Brezhnev, *Our Course: Peace and Socialism*, Part 5, Moscow, 1974, p. 89.

² Lenin, *Coll. Works*, Vol. 31, p. 292.

ment. For instance, the renegade T. Petkoff, expelled from the Party by the Venezuelan Communists, declared openly that "the working class tends to become a conservative factor in socialist society."¹

The working class does not fulfil its historical mission automatically or spontaneously even under socialism. Its inherent role in social development is realised and fulfilled by it in purposeful work for the building of communism.

The leading role of the working class is coupled with growing cooperation among all social groups in the building of socialism and communism. A particular example of this cooperation is the great and ever growing contribution to promoting scientific and technological progress, and to educating the working people on communist lines being made by the socialist intelligentsia.

The policy of the CPSU towards the socialist intelligentsia (which the revisionists are vainly doing their utmost to distort and slander) is clearly formulated in the decisions of the 24th Congress of the CPSU. One of the objectives of the Party is to further enhance the role of the intelligentsia in socialist society, to help it pool its efforts with the working class and collective-farm workers, and bring intellectual and manual workers closer together. In the Soviet Union, the intelligentsia and non-manual workers have increased numerically by 50 per cent in the past decade. The report of the CPSU Central Committee to the 24th Congress of the Party stated: "This is a natural process. It is a result of the Party's policy of achieving the utmost acceleration of scientific and technical

¹ Teodoro Petkoff, *Czechoslovakia. El socialismo como problema*, Caracas, 1969, pp. 67-68.

progress and further raising the cultural and educational standard of the people.”¹ The Directives of the Congress for the period 1971-75 provide for the training of some nine million people with higher or specialised secondary education, including specialists in many of the more vital branches of science and technology. The aim of the party is to encourage all those engaged in intellectual work to combine their specialised knowledge with the Marxist-Leninist outlook and socio-political activity.

It is not Marxist-Leninists, but the revisionists such as Garaudy who belittle the role of various social groups in socialist society. Garaudy writes that in socialist society “in direct contrast to the middle classes, these strata (the intelligentsia), will become increasingly important both numerically and strategically.”² He applies the category of “middle classes” even to the socialist social structure. Moreover, he also assigns the socialist farmer class to the “middle classes” and explicitly belittles its role in social development. For Garaudy the only importance of the farmer class lies in its numerical strength, and he ignores its new political and socio-economic functions, the increasingly industrial character of its work and the growth of its labour productivity, none of which depends on its numerical strength which may vary from one socialist country to another, depending on actual circumstances.

The experience gained by the socialist countries has clearly shown that the farming community plays a very important part in establishing the material basis of socialism and communism. The working class relies on the growing friendly sup-

¹ *24th Congress of the CPSU*, p. 90.

² *The Turning-Point of Socialism*, pp. 194-95.

port it receives from the collective-farm workers in the solution of major economic problems, and it seeks to consolidate its alliance with them and to develop cooperation with them in all social areas. Lenin emphasised the tremendous importance of the alliance between the workers of town and countryside and urged that it be steadily consolidated. The attempts of the revisionists to belittle the role of the farming community in socialist society are nothing other than an attack on this alliance (which is one of the mainstays of Marxism-Leninism), directed against the building of socialism and communism.¹

Distinctions between the working class and farm workers are being eliminated in an intensively developing process within the framework of the worker-farmer alliance in conditions of mature socialism. This process is promoted by growing concentration and specialisation in agriculture, its ever closer integration with industry, and the establishment of large agrarian-industrial complexes. The growing closeness of the ties and cooperation between state-owned and collective-farm enterprises furthers the drawing together and interpenetration of the two forms of socialist property, which facilitates the elimination of distinctions between the two classes.

The continuing industrialisation of agricultural production creates new material conditions for

¹ Such attempts are not new; they were also made by the Trotskyites in their day. The present-day revisionists echo Trotskyist notions on other questions as well. For instance, Garaudy slanders the Soviet "model of socialism" and tries to revive the discredited concept of the "degeneration" of the Soviet Union, which was advanced by the Trotskyites. No wonder he is strongly in sympathy with Trotsky, as may be seen from his interview with the West German magazine *Der Spiegel* (May 10, 1971).

the conversion of agricultural labour into a type of industrial labour, for a drawing together of the workers of town and countryside with respect to the character and content of their labour. This process finds expression in the growth of the number of farm machinery operators, who have become the leading social force in the modern socialist village. Between 1950 and 1972 the number of tractor and lorry drivers and combine and other farm machinery operators in Soviet agriculture rose by 60 per cent to account for 12 per cent of the total number of persons working on collective farms. In addition, the number of workers whose trades involve industrial types of labour is constantly growing in the countryside.

The working class and collective-farm workers are drawing closer together also with regard to the level of their education and culturally, and in respect of income and general living conditions. By the end of the present five-year plan period (1971-75), the average monthly remuneration for collective farm workers will have increased by 30-35 per cent over the five years, and the wages of factory and office workers, by 20-22 per cent.¹ The incomes of collective farmers are steadily coming closer to those of factory and office workers.

Thus, the changes in the socio-economic, cultural and other spheres of life of developed socialist society that are taking place as a result of the Marxist-Leninist policy pursued by the Communist Party are contributing to the elimination of social and class distinctions and to the development of new relations between classes and social groups—relations of friendship, cooperation and

¹ *24th Congress of the CPSU*, p. 288.

collectivity. The Soviet people themselves have become a new historical community of people as a result of deep-going processes of social integration and consolidation of national unity in conditions of mature socialism in the USSR.

A great achievement of socialism is the indivisibility of the generations. In socialist society there are no grounds for conflict between different generations.

The enemies of socialism, the revisionists and the ideologists of capitalism, seek to break the unity of the generations of socialist society, to draw the youth away from the older fighters for the communist ideals and set them against the workers and farmers. They do not scruple to use any means in their efforts. For instance, Garaudy lavishes praise on some contingents of the student movement. Of course, students, whose numerical strength is steadily growing in socialist countries, where higher education is within the reach of the people, play an important part in social life. The students, who are characterised by their creative initiative, energy and adventurous spirit, take an active part in research work, and in creative and social work, alongside the workers, farmers and intelligentsia. Marxist-Leninist parties take full account of the growing importance of the students and their specific demands and interests. The social policy of Marxist-Leninist ruling parties aims at further improving the educational system and material conditions for students such as will favour their all-round development and enable them to take a greater part in social and political affairs.

But Garaudy does not argue that students should play a greater positive role in the socialist countries. He is impressed only by a certain ne-

gative type of student action, such as that seen in Czechoslovakia in 1968-69, inspired by revisionists of the Right and other counter-revolutionary elements. He repeats the ideas of the bankrupt "convergence" theory, holding that student movements in both socialist and capitalist countries show that the scientific and technological revolution has allegedly the same social effects in each case, and that students pursue the same non-class aim, i.e., they defend "human subjectivity" from the "blind mechanisms of industrial civilisation."¹

Accordingly, the revisionists set youth movements against the working class in the same way as they set the intelligentsia against it by demagogically exaggerating the intelligentsia's role in society.

The revisionist ideologists, in unison with Western sociologists, have been harping on an alleged "social degeneration" of the countries of the world socialist community, on the emergence of a new social "hierarchy" and new exploiter classes in them, and so on. Typical in this respect is Djilas's *The New Class*² which Western publishing houses keep putting out in new editions. In this book the author revises the Marxist-Leninist doctrine on classes and alleges that new ruling classes have emerged in the USSR and other socialist countries, classes consisting of party and state functionaries and groups of the intelligentsia possessing "social power". The revisionist theoreticians of the Right have had much to say about what they call the "closed" character of socialist so-

¹ *The Turning-Point of Socialism*, p. 19.

² M. Djilas, *The New Class. An Analysis of the Communist System*, London, 1958. Refurbished versions of many of his ideas are set out by Djilas in other publications (M. Djilas, *The Unperfect Society. Beyond the New Class*, N. Y., 1969).

ciety, and about the supposed emergence of a party intellectual "élite" that allegedly keeps from power other classes and social strata.

Such allegations are a crude slander against socialist reality. Under socialist conditions, a person's merit is judged from the standpoint of his or her capabilities, labour contribution, creative potential and activity in work for the common cause. Leading posts in the party and state apparatus and in economic and socio-political organisations are therefore held by people from different social groups. Many of them come from the working class. As was noted at the 24th Congress of the CPSU, more than 80 per cent of the secretaries of the central committees of the Communist parties of the Union republics and of party territorial and regional committees, of the chairmen of the councils of ministers of the republics and the executive committees of territorial and regional Soviets, and about 70 per cent of the ministers and chairmen of state committees began their careers as industrial or farm workers. In 1971 the number of workers elected to party committees and bureaus amounted to 423,000. In the German Democratic Republic, in the same year, workers accounted for 51.9 per cent of the membership of the leading bodies of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany. Workers make up 43 per cent of the members of the regional committees of the Polish United Workers' Party. In Rumania workers, foremen and technicians account for 81 per cent of the membership of the district and municipal committees of the Communist Party.¹

Many more such figures could be cited. But

¹ *World Marxist Review*, 1973, No. 2, pp. 45-46.

what matters is not only the social origin of the members of party and government bodies. The main thing—recognition of which is denied by the revisionists, who refuse to see the fundamental difference between the state of things under capitalism and under socialism—is that under socialism the activity of the party and state apparatus is subordinated to the great aims and vital interests of the working people. The party and government apparatus is called upon to realise these aims; it serves the people and is accountable to the people. The work of government and party administrative personnel is a specific kind of mental labour. The persons carrying out this function are workers as much as are all other members of socialist society, and the social benefits they receive are in accordance with the basic principle of socialism: "From each according to his ability, to each according to his work."

As we can see, the Right revisionists renounce Marxism-Leninism on all important issues of the social structure of socialist society: on the decisive issue of the role of the working class, on the social functions and social importance of the intelligentsia and the farming class, and on the evaluation of youth and student movements. They reject the general laws and indivisible nature of socialism and the proletarian class approach to social phenomena in modern society.

The "model" of the *political system of socialism* propounded by the revisionists is as dangerous as it is anti-scientific. It lays emphasis on the concept of the "pluralism" of the political system of socialism, presupposing a "free play" of political forces, including those opposed to the socialist social system. This concept is directed against the leading role of the Marxist-Leninist

party in the political system of socialist society and in society as a whole. To be sure, this is done in a camouflaged way, by professing concern for raising the "activity" of the party and "strengthening" socialism.¹

The revisionists declare that there exists in the socialist countries "a contradiction which has not been overcome between the structure of socialist property and the political superstructure",² and offer advice on how to resolve this "contradiction" in theory and practice. Their advice, however, is fallacious and harmful. The revisionist theoreticians regard questions of the relationship between the basis and the superstructure from a wholly metaphysical and eclectic position, often sinking to the level of the exponents of the "convergence" theory.

For instance, in constructing his "model of socialism" Garaudy obviously attempts to combine mechanically the socialist basis and elements of the bourgeois superstructure, thrusting into this "model" formal bourgeois democracy, which, in his own words, "ends at the factory gates". He says that "concrete socialist democracy is not the

¹ This tactic of the Right revisionists is very similar to that of the authors of the anti-communist theory of the "evolution of socialism"—R. Strausz-Hupé, S. Hook, F. Barghorn, Z. Brzezinski and others, who are hopeful of there being a gradual "erosion" of the political structure of socialism, its "liberalisation" in the spirit of bourgeois democracy. Claiming to be concerned with improving the socialist political system, bourgeois ideologists propound ideas of its "transmutation", through a social-democratic stage, into a political system of the bourgeois type. The Right revisionists have seized on these ideas and are propagating them.

² F. Marek, Interview with the Yugoslav magazine *Socijalizam*, 1969, No. 9, p. 1193.

antithesis of formal bourgeois democracy..."¹ And it is not without reason that many revisionists sing the praises of formal bourgeois democracy and bourgeois-democratic traditions.

When he describes his French "model of socialism" (which in essence applies to all developed capitalist countries) Garaudy attaches paramount importance to the "democratisation of socialism". As he sees it, this "democratisation" can be achieved only through promoting a multi-party system under socialism, which, as conceived by Garaudy, allows the existence of political parties with programmes that differ fundamentally from the platform of socialism and are in opposition to it.

What is the Marxist-Leninist attitude toward a plurality of parties under socialism?

This question is connected with the question of the alliance of Communists with other workers' parties and political organisations of the working people. The answer to it depends on the intensity of the class struggle and on the role these parties play in the revolutionary movement and in the political life of their country. Characteristic features of this alliance are its socialist aims and the vanguard role of the Communist party, which ensures the attainment of these aims. But the Communist party does not seek to impose its leading role on anyone. It wins this role in the minds and hearts of the broad masses of the working people through its willingness and ability to lead them along the road of progress, prosperity and development of democracy. Experience shows that the multi-party system existing in a number of countries of the socialist community represents a specific form of the ever growing political unity

¹ *The Turning-Point of Socialism*, p. 218.

of society. Together with the Communist and workers' parties, the other progressive parties work to build socialism and communism, and their unity in action is ensured, logically, by the leading role of the Marxist-Leninist party, won through its many-sided activity in the interests of the working people.

What the revisionists are advocating is a multi-party system which is far from socialist in essence. For instance, in 1968 the Czechoslovak revisionists, following the lead of the anti-communists, actively advocated the establishment of a "political opposition" to the Communist Party and of a system of "equal partnership", signifying, in fact, the formation of political organisations hostile in principle to the interests of socialism.

In conditions of the transitional period, with its plurality of economic formations, and the antagonism of different social forces, there is an objective possibility of the existence of parties opposed in some degree or other to the political vanguard of the working class, but after the building of complete socialism the objective basis for the existence of "political opposition" to the working class and its parties ceases to exist.

The revisionists propose a "model of socialism" in which the political mechanism of formal bourgeois democracy, of a society where class antagonisms exist, is transplanted into the soil of the completely different socialist society, in which there are no classes with conflicting interests and in which bourgeois criteria of democracy cannot be applied. Moreover, they completely ignore a fundamental postulate of historical materialism, namely, that in every historical epoch, to a given mode of production (i.e., a given socio-economic system) there is a corresponding specific political

system, whose character can be explained only in terms of the nature of the economic basis of that society.

Political pluralism is natural to capitalist society, which cannot exist without the proletariat and those classes and strata of the working people which are its allies. And the petty bourgeoisie, the so-called middle strata, continue to exist even at the imperialist stage. The division of bourgeois society into antagonistic classes and social groups naturally presupposes the existence of political parties expressing their interests, and struggle between these parties, also in the form of legal and illegal opposition to the ruling class.

None of this applies to socialism. After winning political power, the working class gradually abolishes private ownership of the means of production and establishes public ownership. And this presupposes the expropriation of capitalists and landowners and the conversion of small-scale commodity production into large-scale socialist social production. The profound significance of the social revolution accomplished by the working class led by the Communist party lies in the fact that along with liberating itself from the yoke of the exploiting and ruling class—the bourgeoisie—it at the same time liberates the whole of society from all exploitation and oppression and affirms the socio-political and ideological unity of the people.

The socialism for which the working class fights does not perpetuate classes but transforms them, leading to the overcoming of class distinctions. This accords with the vital interests not only of the working class but of all the working people, enabling the working class to establish a stable alliance with the other strata of the work-

ing people both in the period of transition from capitalism to socialism and in the socialist stage of the building of communism. This alliance is the logical continuation and development of the alliance established during the anti-monopoly struggle. The working class is the staunchest and most consistent fighter for the vital interests of the working people. Headed by the Communist party armed with the scientific theory of Marxism-Leninism, the working class has the clearest conception of the ultimate goal, communism, and of how to achieve it. The working class and its political vanguard therefore become the leading force of this alliance. They rally all the forces which are willing to adopt the socialist platform. That is why "political pluralism", which is organic to bourgeois society, has no objective basis in conditions of victorious socialism.

All political projects of the fanciers of the Right-revisionist "pluralistic system" aimed at artificially creating forces to stand "in opposition" to socialism, mean in practice paving the way for the restoration of bourgeois democracy. Any attempt to establish, under socialist conditions, a multi-party system with opposition parties would quickly and inevitably lead to measures for the revival and political organisation of the former exploiting classes (for without such anti-socialist forces there is no basis, in socialist society, for the functioning of parties hostile to the party of the working class). Such projects are clearly indicative of a striving to reverse the socialist development of the classes and social groups which had a petty-bourgeois nature in the past, and thereby to undermine the socio-political foundation of socialism—the alliance of all the classes and strata of society, with the leading role being play-

ed by the working class. The reactionary character of such attempts is obvious.

The criterion of real socialist democracy is not the number of political parties in existence, but the extent of the involvement of the working class and all the working people in the administration of the state and the management of its socio-political, economic and cultural life.

The higher development of political relations in socialist society is realised in the process of the all-round development of democracy. The Communist and workers' parties of the countries of the socialist community regard democracy as a decisive means of heightening the socio-political activity of the people and drawing them into the management of production and the affairs of state and society. The measure of development of democracy is determined by the concrete historical situation, the development of the productive forces, changes in the socio-economic structure of society, the cultural level and the level of political awareness of the people, etc.

The revisionists, and especially those of them who subscribe to the "etatist" views as to the character of the socialist social system, oppose the state to democracy and state government to public self-government. They depict the socialist state as a conservative force, alien to society, which inhibits the development of the individual. The importance of immediate, direct democracy at the level of small labour and territorial units is exaggerated by them in contradistinction to representative democracy, while questions of self-government are often confined, as has been noted, within the bounds of production associations and working collectives.

All this is in irreconcilable conflict with the

theory of scientific communism. Marxism-Leninism has proved that democracy cannot be viewed in isolation from the state. Democracy is a definite form of the state; the socialist state means genuine democracy for the working class and for all working people. The development of socialist democracy presupposes, of course, not only a higher form of statehood, but also a constant growth in the activity of the party, the trade unions, and youth, women's and other mass organisations, and extension of democracy in the life of the working collectives of industrial and agricultural enterprises and institutions. Socialism means a steady development of democracy in breadth (embracing not only the political but also the economic, social, cultural and other areas of the life of society) and in depth (the striving to perfect and ever more fully apply the principles of socialist democracy).

Socialism ensures genuine self-government of the working people "who know no yoke and no authority except the authority of their own unity, of their own, more class-conscious, bold, solid, revolutionary and steadfast vanguard".¹

In the conditions of socialism it is fundamentally wrong to postulate any antithesis between state government and self-government. The socialist revolution eliminates the exploiting classes' monopoly of the management of the state, abolishes the alienation of the state from the people, from society, and enlists the participation of the widest sections of the working people in administering the state. The socialist state is a powerful instrument in the hands of the working peo-

¹ Lenin, *Coll. Works*, Vol. 29, p. 423.

ple, that is, all members of society for realising their common vital interests and aims. It is the embodiment of genuine collectivism, whereas the bourgeois state, being as it is a machine of oppression and exploitation, is collectivist only in appearance. As a result of such cardinal changes in its socio-class nature the state turns, under socialism, into a form of self-government of the working people. The basis of the socialist state system is made up of representative bodies which act at the same time as bodies of state power and of public self-government. The Soviets, for example, are the basic political bodies of the USSR. There are some 50,000 of them, from the Supreme Soviet of the USSR to local Soviets. They have close on 2.2 million deputies and more than 25 million public-minded volunteer helpers. In the post-war years alone more than 20 million people have participated, through the Soviets, in the administration of the state.

An analysis of the activity of the local Soviets, which constitute a key element in the political organisation of Soviet society, reveals their central importance as the most representative organs of state administration and people's self-government. Guiding the political development of Soviet society, the Communist Party pursues a firm policy of further enhancing the role of the local Soviets in promoting the nation's economic and cultural development. An example is furnished by the decisions of the Central Committee of the CPSU adopted in 1967 and 1971, on measures to improve the work of village, township, district and city Soviets of Working People's Deputies. Legislation to extend the powers and rights of local Soviets in managing the affairs of society has been adopted in all the Union republics.

What are the rights and powers of local Soviets?

As bodies of state administration and self-government, they decide all questions of local significance in their territory in accordance with the general national interests of the working people and specific local requirements. All decisions of a Soviet coming within its competence are binding upon collective and state farms and all enterprises, institutions and organisations situated on its territory, and upon all officials and all citizens of the territory in question. The Soviets approve long-term and current plans for the economic, social and cultural development of their territory and have the right to dispose of extra-budgetary funds and to approve independently various types of local building projects. The Soviets have the right to approve, in conjunction with the appropriate higher bodies of state administration, the appointment and dismissal of the heads of local educational, health and cultural institutions and service establishments. They also control the local organisations of the militia, etc.

Local Soviets take part in the discussion of problems of republic-wide significance and of matters affecting the USSR as a whole. This enhances their role as integral units of the system of state administration.

The activity of the local Soviets has increased considerably in recent years. For example, rural Soviets organised a large-scale campaign for land protection and rational land utilisation, and by the beginning of 1973 succeeded in reclaiming about one million hectares of formerly unused land. The Soviets also take an active part in promoting the socialist emulation movement for higher efficiency and production.

The Soviets are an embodiment of the profound democratism of the socialist state, of genuine rule by the people. The Soviets are elected by all citizens who have reached the age of 18, on the basis of universal, equal and direct suffrage by secret ballot. In the last elections of the Soviets 99.96 per cent of the voters went to the polls. At present the Soviets represent more than 154 million people, that is, the entire adult population of the country.

Candidates for election are nominated by public and political organisations of the working people from among the worthiest citizens, those who are industrious, public-spirited and enjoy their confidence. Almost two-thirds of the deputies are workers and collective farmers; women make up about 46 per cent of the deputies, young people, more than 25 per cent, and non-party members, 55.5 per cent. All the nations and nationalities inhabiting the Soviet Union—more than one hundred in all—are represented in the Soviets.

Deputies have substantial rights and powers. On instructions from the Soviet they inspect and report on the work of enterprises and institutions. A deputy may submit proposals to the Soviet and amendments to decisions of the Soviet, and refer formal inquiries to higher executive bodies. For example, about 40,000 such inquiries were dealt with in 1971 at sessions of the Soviets of Deputies.

The 24th Congress of the CPSU called for further increasing the authority and range of activity of deputies. In September 1972, giving effect to the decisions of the congress, the USSR Supreme Soviet adopted a Law on the Status of Deputies of the Soviets of Working People's Deputies in the USSR. The law defines the powers of De-

puties of Soviets of all levels, from the Supreme Soviet to village Soviets, and the duties of officials with regard to deputies. The law considerably extends the deputies' right of control over the work of administrative bodies and officials and establishes a number of organisational, political, legal and material guarantees of the deputies' activity. State institutions, enterprises, organisations and their officials are required to cooperate with the deputy in the exercise of his powers. Provision is made for releasing the deputy from his normal work, without loss of income, for the time he needs to perform his duties as deputy, for supplying him with the necessary information, and for ensuring his labour rights and deputy's immunity.

The responsibility borne by deputies is equally great. Deputies are required to report to their electors at least twice a year, and these reports serve as an important form of direct people's control over the work of the Soviets. The electors have the right to recall their deputy if he or she has failed to justify their confidence or has acted in a manner incompatible with the office of deputy. Such instances are very rare, of course. Deputies strive to fulfil their mandate as effectively as possible, to comply with the electors' wishes with regard to the further provision of cultural amenities and everyday services, and the development of the economy of their area, etc. For example, the Soviets elected in 1971 accepted for implementation more than half a million electors' proposals, nearly all of which have already been carried out.

It is important that deputies combine performance of their duties in the Soviets with their ordinary work in industrial and agricultural enter-

prises, etc. Thanks to this they are in a position, as Lenin wrote, to execute their own laws, themselves to test the results achieved in reality, and to account directly to their constituents.¹

Thus, in its place and role in the state, form of election and content of its activity, the Soviet is an authority open to all, carrying out its functions before the eyes of the masses, accessible to the masses, springing directly from the masses, and being a direct and immediate instrument of the popular masses, of their will.²

This is the basis on which the Soviets operate, now as in the days of the October Revolution, and the statements of the Right revisionists about the alleged "degeneration" of the Soviets can only be qualified as crude slander. Marek, for instance, went so far as to declare that "there are no Soviets in the original meaning of the word."³ Such assertions are intended for the uninformed.

In continuing the process of the further democratisation of socialist statehood, the CPSU attaches great importance to the promotion of democratic principles directly in the working collectives of factories, state farms, collective farms and other institutions of the economy. "Our democracy in action is the right of every citizen, every collective and every Republic to take part in deciding questions of social life, combating any departures from the rules and principles of socialist community living, criticising shortcomings and taking an active part in eliminating them," Leonid Brezhnev declared in his address to the

¹ Lenin, *Coll. Works*, Vol. 25, p. 424.

² *Ibid.*, Vol. 31, p. 352.

³ *Wiener Tagebuch*, 1970, Nr. 6.

joint meeting of the CPSU Central Committee, the USSR Supreme Soviet and the RSFSR Supreme Soviet to mark the centenary of the birth of Lenin.¹

Both the state and non-state (public) self-government of the working people in conditions of socialism have the same socio-class essence and identical aims and tasks. Developed socialism is characterised by an ever closer integration of state and public forms of government, with the leading role in this process being played by state power. This is natural, for the state represents the common interests of the entire people, is an expression of their common will. Precisely this is also the aim of the process of the formation of communist public self-government, which will be finally affirmed during the higher phase of communism, when state forms of government wither away.

The need for state forms of self-government of the working people still exists under socialism. During the first phase of the building of communism, Lenin showed, the state is needed to safeguard public ownership of the means of production, to exercise control "over the measure of labour and the measure of consumption",² and to accomplish the tasks of communist construction. With reference to the withering away of the state, Lenin pointed to "the protracted nature of this process and its dependence upon the rapidity of development of the *higher phase* of communism".³ His conclusion is explicit: "For the state to wither

¹ L. I. Brezhnev, *Lenin's Cause Lives on and Triumphs*, p. 44.

² Lenin, *Coll. Works*, Vol. 25, p. 470.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 469.

away completely, complete communism is necessary." ¹

That is why the notion of self-government of the working people under socialism without or despite the state is untenable as a practical proposition. No matter how insistent the calls for the replacement of the state by a stateless "self-governing system", this goal will remain unrealisable until the higher phase of communism is reached. And if the functions of the state are abolished artificially, in the absence of the necessary objective and subjective conditions, these functions will inevitably be "distributed" among the different branches of public self-government, which will thus begin to assume the character of the state, losing their specific character and significance and taking on functions that are inappropriate to them. Clearly, this will cause anomalies in the political system of socialist society. The right policy, as has been noted, is to combine and develop in every way both state and public forms of self-government.

The process of the development of socialist democracy assumes different forms in different countries, but there is one key question that determines the class essence of democracy, its truly socialist character. It is the question of the leading role of the working class and growth of its political activity. The facts show that in the countries of the socialist community the working class is the leading force in political life, and takes an active part in deciding socially important questions, both at local level and in the highest bodies of representative power. For example, in 1973 of the 1,500 Deputies of the USSR Supreme

¹ Lenin, *Coll. Works*, Vol. 25, p. 468.

Soviet, 481 were workers. Among the 352 members of Hungary's National Assembly 140 are workers or members of workers' families. 266 out of 500 deputies of the GDR's People's Chamber come from workers' families. Workers number about 100,000, or 47.1 per cent of all the deputies of the national committees of all levels in Czechoslovakia.¹ A central task of the policy of the Communist parties is to ensure the continued steady enhancement of the political role and social importance of the working class as the vanguard force in the fight for communism.

Socialist democracy, which is a class democracy by its nature serves the vital interests of all the working people. Referring to its immeasurable superiority over bourgeois democracy, Lenin wrote: "It is the people, who even in the most democratic bourgeois republics, while possessing equal rights by law, have in fact been debarred by thousands of devices and subterfuges from participation in political life and enjoyment of democratic rights and liberties, that are now drawn into constant and unfailing, moreover, decisive, participation in the democratic administration of the state."² Enjoying the great advantages of socialist democracy, the peoples of the socialist countries reject the "advice" of the propagandists of capitalism and the revisionists of the Right who seek to remake socialism in their own, bourgeois fashion.

Giving a fitting rebuff to the anti-communists and revisionists, Leonid Brezhnev declared: "No matter how our adversaries may wring their hands over the 'imperfection' of socialism, no matter what touching concern they may display for its

¹ *World Marxist Review*, No. 2, 1973.

² *Lenin Coll. Works*, Vol. 28, p. 465.

'improvement' and 'humanisation', we repeat with pride Lenin's words about proletarian, socialist democracy being a million times more democratic than any bourgeois democracy. Our state was, is and will continue to be a state of the working people, a state for the working people, a state which is governed by the working people."¹

In the sphere of *spiritual life*, the Right revisionists' "model of socialism" embraces what they call an ideological pluralism. Trying to provide a theoretical substantiation for the concept of "ideological pluralism", Garaudy declares that changes in science and technology give rise to inner changes in "doctrines and men... which postulate pluralism as the principle of cross-fertilisation."² But Garaudy's "open" or "pluralistic" Marxism is no more than a mechanical admixture of elements of various teachings, even Christianity. It is an eclectic mixture of views hostile to the working class, to Marxism-Leninism and to proletarian party principles.

The supporters of "pluralistic" or "polyversional" Marxism do not accept that Marxist theory is an integral doctrine of international significance, the scientific ideology of the working class, and the only correct theory of social development and socialist and communist construction, a theory that has been proven in practice. They contend that there are many versions of Marxism which are of equal importance and which are determined by national, racial, psychological and other factors.

With their concept of "ideological pluralism", the Right revisionists oppose the class struggle against the bourgeois ideology, advocate "peaceful

¹ L. I. Brezhnev, *Lenin's Cause Lives on and Triumphs*, p. 45.

² *The Turning-Point of Socialism*, p. 45.

coexistence" in the ideological sphere, and call for the "conciliation" of the theory of scientific communism with bourgeois and religious doctrines, for the absolute "freedom" of views, including those that are aimed at undermining socialism.

The revisionists declare that in so far as no private ownership of the information media exists under socialism, it is possible to speak about the unlimited freedom of speech and of the press in socialist society.¹ For all its seeming "democratic" character, this is an incorrect notion, firstly because public ownership of the information media does not automatically imply the conversion of the ideology of the working class into the ideology of the whole society (this requires persevering ideological-educational work among the people and the accomplishment of a genuine cultural revolution, etc.), and, secondly, because even in conditions of the dominance of public ownership the necessity remains of taking a class approach to the content of spiritual freedom, to the struggle against ideas hostile to socialism.

The historical experience of the building of socialism shows that the bourgeoisie and its ideological supporters employ the slogans of "freedom" of speech and of the press in their struggle against the working class. As Lenin said, they "turned 'democracy' and 'freedom' into slogans leading up to the overthrow of the Soviet power."² Freedom is a supreme value, but only when it serves the cause of progress and not reaction. That is why the working people of the socialist countries, educated in the spirit of Marxism-Leninism, are irreconcilable in the struggle against bourgeois and

¹ F. Marek, *Begründung für Begrüssung, in Weg und Ziel*, Wien, 1968, Nr. 9, S. 403.

² Lenin, *Coll. Works*, Vol. 32, p. 190.

revisionist ideas, against nationalism, chauvinism and the various anti-scientific "models of socialism", and do not allow freedom for the propaganda of anti-socialist views.

A profound humanism and democratism are fundamental to the socialist way of life. The working people of the countries of the socialist community make wise use of their freedom of speech, of the press and of assembly and other political freedoms and social rights, for which socialism provides real guarantees.

Garaudy, Šik, Marek and other revisionists write prolifically about socialist humanism and pose as the only interpreters of the Marxist teaching on humanism. In reality their interpretation of socialist humanism does not in any way accord with its real content and the Marxist-Leninist understanding of the problem.

The approach of Marxism-Leninism to humanism proceeds from social reality, from the real class position of specific people, and from the character of the social relations obtaining. It opens the way to the complete liberation of man from all forms of oppression and alienation and to the harmonious development of the individual. The present-day revisionists of the Right borrow ideas from the exponents of existentialism, anthropologism and other fashionable trends in bourgeois philosophy, and proceed, in their discourses on humanism, from concepts of an abstract, extra-class human personality, and freedom "in general", and try on this basis to "remould" real people. To them the building of socialist society is not the result of class struggle and revolutionary transformations, but of the spontaneous movement of people towards some extra-class, general humanistic ethical ideal. A whole

complex of material, social and spiritual prerequisites is necessary for the all-round development of human capacities. In an exploitative society, such prerequisites cannot be created for the majority of the population, whereas socialism provides real conditions for the development of the human qualities of all men of labour, all members of society and not just individuals. Herein lies both the complexity of the education of the new man, and the reality of socialist humanism.

In socialist conditions the individual has complete freedom from exploitation, from unemployment or discrimination on account of sex, social origin, nationality or race. Socialism provides every member of society with the possibility of a free choice of occupation, active participation in management, creative labour, and full development of his or her capacities.

In this connection the raising of the educational and cultural level of the working people is of great importance. Not a single capitalist country provides such favourable conditions for the education and cultural advancement of all the people, for providing all with access to the achievements of science, literature and the arts, as the countries of the socialist community do. Three-quarters of the population of pre-revolutionary Russia were illiterate. Today the USSR is a country of universal literacy. All the cultural wealth of the nation has been placed within reach of the people.

The founders of Marxism-Leninism saw the abolition of private ownership and all exploitation, the creation of an abundance of material and spiritual values, the Communist education of the working people, as being the decisive conditions for the genuine freedom of the individual, for the har-

mony of his interests and the interests of society, and for bringing out the full potentialities of the people. In this lies the genuine humanism of the socialist social system.

Engels, in a letter to the Italian socialist, Giuseppe Canepa, who had asked him to formulate the central idea of the future epoch in contrast to the old epoch, about which Dante had said, "Some people rule, others suffer," quoted this celebrated passage from *Manifesto of the Communist Party*: "In the place of the old bourgeois society, with its classes and class antagonisms, we shall have an association, in which the free development of each is the condition for the free development of all."¹

In contrast, the revisionists' abstract-humanist rhetoric does not elevate the socialist individual, does not lead to the development of his scientific thinking and to the realisation of his creative potential, but, on the contrary, creates conditions for his spiritual enslavement by the alien, bourgeois ideology, channels the activity of people in a direction opposed to the interests of the working people, and prevents the growth of socialist humanism.

It can thus be said that a comprehensive analysis of the basic features of the Right-revisionist "model of socialism" advanced as the alternative to scientific socialism shows how far its authors have departed from the Marxist-Leninist theory of socialism, how diametrically opposed their views are to the basic ideas of Marxism-Leninism. In the economic field this "model" is characterised by a deformation of socialist production relations, by the giving of free rein to market for-

¹ K. Marx and F. Engels, *Sel. Works*, Vol. 1, p. 127.

ces and by a paving of the way to private-ownership formations. In the political sphere it leads to the degeneration of the genuinely socialist political system into a version of bourgeois and petty-bourgeois democracy. In the spiritual sphere the revisionists' "model" opens the floodgates to bourgeois values and brings with it the spiritual enslavement of the individual. All this testifies to the wholly reactionary essence of the "models of socialism" constructed by the revisionist renegades.

The "plurality of models of socialism" concept propagated by Garaudy, Šik and other revisionists is directly aimed against Marxism-Leninism and the real socialism that now exists; it is designed to discredit it and to undermine the countries of the world socialist community. Garaudy, Fischer, Šik, Marek, Petkoff and other renegades are particularly vicious in attacking the Soviet Union, the world's first socialist state. Fischer even holds that the very existence of the Soviet Union is a major obstacle to the development of the socialist revolution in the West; he also alleges that communist construction in the USSR is extremely reactionary and has nothing in common with communism. Anti-Sovietism has, in general, become the keynote of all the "theories" advanced by the traitors to the socialist cause.

In this respect the Right-revisionists see eye to eye with the Maoists. For instance, Garaudy, who at one time advocated "humane" socialism and lauded the "Czechoslovak model of socialism", spoke approvingly of the "cultural revolution" in China. The reason for such unprincipled bows to Peking lies exactly in Garaudy's anti-Sovietism. Just as the Maoists will enter into an alliance with anyone, the only condition being that this alliance

be anti-Soviet, so Garaudy is prepared to see in the brutalities and vandalism of the "cultural revolution" in China some new way, perhaps the "greatest" discovery in China's socio-political development, only and precisely because of the Maoists' rabid anti-Sovietism. "The Chinese Communists," he writes, "are building a model of development of society which is a radical alternative to the Western and Soviet models of civilisation."¹

The "plurality of models of socialism" concept, which splits up socialism into various models fundamentally differing from one another in their economic, social and political structures, is permeated with ideas of exclusiveness and national isolationism and is incompatible with proletarian internationalism. It artificially opposes some socialist countries to others, and the socialist countries as a group to countries in which socialist revolutions have not yet triumphed (an opposition which can only serve to undermine the international unity of the revolutionary forces). It is incompatible with proletarian internationalism also because it calls on the working class and other sections of the working people in the capitalist countries to renounce the vast, well-tested store of experience gained by their class brothers in the socialist countries. To heed such a call would mean impoverishing the theoretical arsenal and hampering the activity of the revolutionary forces in the capitalist countries. The "plurality" concept of the revisionists therefore serves the forces of imperialism in their opposition to the forces of progress and the builders of the new, socialist society. It is directly harmful to the cause of the revolutionary movement of the working class.

¹ *L'Alternative*, p. 130.

III. Revisionist Distortions of the Leninist Teaching on the Party

One of the fundamentals of Marxist-Leninist theory and practice has now become the target for intensive ideological attack. It is Lenin's teaching on the party, its role in society, and the principles of its organisation.

The development of the world revolutionary process clearly shows the correctness of the Marxist-Leninist thesis that the working class can destroy capitalism and build a socialist society only if it acts under the guidance of a revolutionary party of the new type.

Lenin's teaching on the proletarian party of the new type is based on Marxism and the enormous experience gained by the Russian and international revolutionary movements. The Party is the vanguard of the working class, its organised detachment, the highest form of political organisation. Its function is to promote the self-determination of the working class and help it understand and fulfil its historical mission.

The characteristic features of the party of the new type are its revolutionary outlook, its irreconcilable opposition to capitalism, and its determination to fight for a communist society. All its activity is devoted to preparing the working

class for assuming political power and leadership in the building of socialism and communism.

The Communist Party, the politically conscious vanguard of the proletariat, is guided by the revolutionary theory of Marxism-Leninism, which expresses in a scientific way the vital interests of the proletariat. Lenin constantly stressed that Communists throughout the world must make this party "the vanguard of the revolutionary proletariat without permitting it to become divorced from the masses, but, on the contrary, by linking it more and more closely with them, imbuing them with revolutionary consciousness and rousing them for the revolutionary struggle."¹ The main strength of the Communist Party lies in its close ties with the people and its ability to lead them.

Leonid Brezhnev, in his speech at the 1969 International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties, said: "The historical experience of many countries, the experience of the class struggle has given convincing evidence of how necessary the activity of the Communist parties is for mankind and how fruitful this activity is for social development. Guided by Marxist-Leninist theory, the Communist parties show the peoples the road to the communist future. They rally the peoples to the struggle and steadfastly march in the van of the mass movements for the great goals of social progress. Communists are always in the front ranks of the fighters for vital rights of the working people, for peace. They carry high the invincible banner of the socialist revolution."²

But the revisionists and others like them not only deny, explicitly or implicitly, that the work-

¹ Lenin, *Coll. Works*, Vol. 33, p. 209.

² *International Meeting*, p. 155.

ing class plays the leading role in the revolutionary process, but actively seek to prevent it from playing this role. They direct their main blows against the Marxist-Leninist parties, because they are well aware that these parties are the key force in the struggle of the working class for socialism and communism. Seemingly irreconcilable foes, from Trotskyites and ultra- "Leftists" to extreme Right-wing opportunists, unite to attack the Leninist teaching on the party and its leading role in the revolutionary movement and the building of the new society. In doing so they adopt each other's methods and arguments. The main aim of the revisionists of all kinds is the same—to destroy and eliminate the party of the proletariat and subordinate the working class ideologically and organisationally to the bourgeoisie.

To begin with, the revisionists deny the objective need for the working class to have a political party at all. Resorting to outright falsification, they present the Leninist teaching on the party as being based on a subjectivist approach and as divorced from and opposed to the basic Marxist principles. Fischer and Marek maintain that the importance which Lenin attached to the revolutionary organisation of the working class and all his tremendous work of building the party of the new type were not the outcome of the historical needs of the class struggle of the proletariat, as revealed by Marx and Engels; instead they put it down to what they claim was a personal interpretation by Lenin of the role of the subjective factor in social development. They write that the "emphasis on the subjective factor is naturally connected with the conclusions which Lenin drew proceeding from the conditions of the political struggle in Russia, the illegality of the workers'

movement, and its persecution by the tsarist police".¹

This contention shows that its authors depart from the Marxist understanding of the dialectics of the objective and the subjective in history. As Lenin wrote, "Marxism differs from all other socialist theories in the remarkable way it combines complete scientific sobriety in the analysis of the objective state of affairs and the objective course of evolution with the most emphatic recognition of the importance of the revolutionary energy, revolutionary creative genius, and revolutionary initiative of the masses—and also, of course, of individuals, groups, organisations, and parties that are able to discover and achieve contact with one or another class."² It is well known that already in the *Manifesto of the Communist Party* Marx and Engels proclaimed the need to establish a class party of the proletariat, and that later on, in their works, speeches and letters, they advanced a number of basic ideas about such a party, whose aim would be to enlighten the proletariat and educate it as to its class tasks, to guide its revolutionary struggle and to ensure its victory in the social revolution. In a letter dated December 18, 1889, Engels wrote to G. Trier: "For the proletariat to be strong enough to win the decisive day it must—and this Marx and I have been arguing ever since 1847—form a separate party distinct from all others and opposed to them, a conscious class party."³ Along with elaborating these questions theoretically, the founders of Marxism took practical action to-

¹ E. Fischer, F. Marek, *Was Lenin wirklich sagte*, S. 29.

² Lenin, *Coll. Works*, Vol. 13, p. 36.

³ Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, *Selected Correspondence*, Moscow, 1965, p. 409.

wards building the first proletarian organisations based on the principles of scientific communism.

The opposition of the present-day revisionists to the need for building the political party of the working class is explained by their departure from Marxism also in the matter of the interaction of social being and social consciousness, by their having "elevated the worship of, and servility towards, spontaneity to the dignity of a theory".¹ A vivid case in point is Garaudy's efforts to counterpose to the conscious struggle of the working class under the leadership of the Communist Party "new motives inspired 'from within'", the "cultivated spontaneity" of his "new historical bloc" allegedly capable of "blending harmoniously with political and theoretical motivations".² He regards the Marxist-Leninist party's day-to-day work of instilling a socialist consciousness in the people as coercion over the spontaneity of the movement, as "enlightened despotism", and proclaims rejection of the Leninist conception of the party and of the socialist education of the people to be "one of the principal subjective conditions of a revolutionary situation".³

What we have here is a complete renunciation of the Marxist-Leninist teaching on the proletarian party, deliberate disregard for the fact that the entire course of development of the class struggle during the present stage demonstrates the vital need for steadily enhancing the leading role of the Communist Party in the mass movements of the working people, and testifies to the continuing urgency of its task of instilling a socialist conscious-

¹ Lenin, *Coll. Works*, Vol. 5, p. 317.

² *L'Alternative*, p. 108.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 215.

ness in the people. The march of events constantly bears out the correctness of Lenin's words that "The greater the spontaneous upsurge of the masses and the more widespread the movement, the more rapid, incomparably so, the demand for greater consciousness in the theoretical, political, and organisational work..."¹ of the Communist party.

Worship of spontaneity, and liquidationist tendencies are characteristic also of other revisionists. For instance, Fischer calls for the elimination of the Communist parties in their present form by dissolving them in a "Left" coalition in which Communists would not have their own organisation. He says: "I believe that most of the existing parties are out-of-date in their form and type. I see the possibility of establishing new unions of like-minded persons and fighters, regardless of old petrified attitudes—if you like, from Marxists and non-Marxists, Communists and Social-Democrats, Catholics and Protestants..."² It is not explained how these motley organisations can be called "unions of like-minded persons" and what aim they will pursue in their "struggle". At any rate, such amorphous organisations, not being based on proletarian class consciousness and discipline, are bound to develop spontaneous anarchic features, and present no danger to the monopolies. The truth of the matter is that it is the very "organisation not based on principle" which "in practice converts the workers into a miserable appendage of the bourgeoisie in power".³ Fischer seems to want to reassure the bourgeoisie, saying that these organisations will be established "with

¹ Lenin, *Coll. Works*, Vol. 5, p. 396.

² *Stern*, 1969, Nr. 49, S. 144.

³ Lenin, *Coll. Works*, Vol. 11, p. 321.

their contradictions, without recipes; at first they will be full of mistakes".¹ Such "reforms" are clearly intended to weaken and submerge the workers' and democratic movement, to deprive it of a clear purpose and of its political leadership and push it onto the road of errors and gambles.

Marek, for his part, calls for the replacement of the Communist Party of Austria by a supra-party "pressure movement", an idea of obviously bourgeois origin. The use of this term reveals the nature of his proposed movement—it is confined to the framework of a given socio-political system and it does not seek the replacement of that system. Austrian Communists have rightly pointed out that Marek's idea was to set up a "loose pressure movement instead of, without, and against the Communist Party of Austria which, regardless of all difficulties, is the only revolutionary party and the most powerful Left-wing force in Austria."²

In attacking the Communist party and its leading role in the revolutionary movement, the revisionists seek to drive a wedge between the Marxist-Leninist party and other mass organisations of the workers. They are particularly active in their efforts to set the biggest mass organisations of the working people, the trade unions, against the Communist parties. In these efforts they seek to capitalise on some old concepts still current among certain sections of the working class, including some of the trade union membership.

The firmly established traditions of the trade union movement, which was founded in many capitalist countries long before the appearance

¹ *Der Spiegel*, 1969, Nr. 47, S. 149.

² *Volksstimme*, August 5, 1970.

of political parties, its efficacy in the economic struggle, and its mass influence and authority create, under certain conditions, a nutrient medium for narrow craft-union and professional attitudes typical of anarcho-syndicalism. Those with such attitudes question the need for a political party of the working class and for its leading role in the class struggle, claiming that the trade unions, as the biggest mass organisation opposed to capitalist exploitation, are strong enough to head the struggle both against capitalism and even for the building of socialism.

Such views have been cultivated in the workers' movement for many decades. Formerly, anarcho-syndicalism was a kind of "complication" after an illness and was ultra-Left in its orientation. Today, however, anarcho-syndicalism represents a reaction from the Right to the overall leftward shift of the working class. Also being an advocate of the spontaneity of the working-class movement, anarcho-syndicalism serves at the same time the aims of isolating the Communist party from the mass of the working people and subordinating the latter to bourgeois influence. Small wonder, therefore, that in their attacks against the Communist parties the Right revisionists make use of contemporary anarcho-syndicalism as a weapon as well.

Again claiming that his understanding of reality is most consistent with the times, Garaudy declares that the relationship between economics and politics today is not what it was at the beginning of the century. Then, he maintains, trade union activity was still limited to struggle for better terms for the sale of labour power, while the struggle against the system as a whole was waged by the political parties of the working class. But

today, he says, "liberation cannot be 'bestowed', brought 'from without' by parties.... It will either arise at the work-place or will never arise at all."¹ He regards the party of the working class merely as an "outside organisation acting only on the political level", and is opposed to "shifting" onto it the tasks of liberating the "new historical bloc", in ensuring whose unity "the trade unions are called upon to play a much more important part."²

Garaudy obviously seeks to isolate the vanguard of the working class from the mass of the workers, to oppose them to each other, to depict the Communist Party as something alien, imposed upon the working class from without, something which the working class can do quite well without in its struggle for socialism. Such utterances play into the hands of the monopolists, for they are aimed directly against the activity of Communist parties in enterprises and in the ranks of the working class, and against their efforts to make socialist consciousness an integral part of the struggle of the working people and to give leadership to this struggle.

Recent history has shown that now, as before, in the day-to-day struggle of the working class for the development of the revolutionary process, purposeful leadership of the movement can be provided only by the political organisation of the proletariat, which overcomes the corporative narrow-mindedness which is to a greater or lesser extent characteristic of the movement of the working people for immediate economic demands. "...Only the political party of the working class,

¹ *L'Alternative*, p. 201.

² *Ibid.*, pp. 200, 201. 207.

i.e., the Communist Party, is capable of uniting, training and organising a vanguard of the proletariat and of the whole mass of the working people that alone will be capable of withstanding the inevitable petty-bourgeois vacillations of this mass and the inevitable traditions and relapses of narrow craft unionism or craft prejudices among the proletariat, and of guiding all the united activities of the whole of the proletariat, i.e., of leading it politically and through it, the whole mass of the working people.”¹ This passage from Lenin’s works has lost none of its relevance today. Raising the proletariat to a higher form of class struggle—political struggle—the Communist Party takes into consideration also the important role of allies of the proletariat: the farmers, the urban middle strata, the intelligentsia, the youth, women. Advancing to the forefront that which unites these different social and political groups, the party strives to rally them into a single anti-monopoly alliance capable of securing through its actions favourable conditions for the struggle for socialism.

The revisionists’ attacks on the leading role of the Communist and workers’ parties take the form also of their striving to oppose the struggle of the youth, and particularly the student youth, to the struggle of the working class, of calls for organising a “truly revolutionary” student movement independent of the working class and hence of its party.² The revisionists are still continuing their efforts to corrupt youth organisations, to ingratiate themselves with the youth by calling them “the motive power of progress”,

¹ Lenin, *Coll. Works*, Vol. 32, p. 246.

² *Der Spiegel*, 1971, Nr. 20, S. 120.

and to detach and oppose the youth to the party of the proletariat. Marek, for instance, has declared that "a revolutionary youth organisation can be viable only if it has in its political platform, which in certain conditions may not be coordinated with the party leadership, clear proof of its autonomy".¹

It is especially important, in present-day conditions to expose the attempts of the false "friends" of the youth to lure the youth movement with pseudo-revolutionary ideas and calls into rash actions, into petty-bourgeois revolutionism. The increased political activity of the youth has become an important factor in the social life of many developed capitalist countries. Positively assessing the growth of the youth movement, Communist parties endeavour to guide youth actions into conscious, purposeful struggle to change the existing system. Close ties of Communists with the youth movement, and dissemination of the ideas of scientific socialism, help the youth towards a correct understanding of the ways and means of struggle against imperialism. Working for effective cooperation between the working class and the younger generation of the capitalist countries, Communists pursue the collectively elaborated policy of the international Communist movement which, with reference to the youth, affirms that "only close unity with the working-class movement and its Communist vanguard can open for them truly revolutionary prospects"²

The revisionists are particularly vehement in

¹ *Kleine Zeitung*, Graz, (Österreich), November 1, 1969.

² *International Meeting*, p. 26.

their opposition to the leading role played by the Communist party in the countries which actually have socialism. Garaudy, in his "Turning-Point", maintains that the leading role of the Marxist-Leninist party could be a temporary necessity at some stage or other of the revolution in the case of a backward country surrounded by enemies and lacking material means and adequate leadership, but that it cannot be elevated to an immutable principle of the building of socialism. Such revisionist attacks are not without definite purpose. The question of the place and role of the Communist party in the life of socialist society is a fundamental question because the future of socialism in individual countries and that of the world socialist system as a whole hinges on the role of the Communist party in socialist society.

The guiding role of the Communist party assumes still greater significance after the take-over of power, in the period of socialist and communist construction. This is due to many factors: the magnitude and complexity of the tasks of building socialism and communism, which call for an ever higher level of political and organisational guidance, the growth of the creative activity of the people, and the involvement of millions of working people in managing state affairs and production; the development of socialist democracy and enhancement of the role of public organisations; the growing importance of the theory of scientific communism and of its creative development and dissemination; the need for the communist education of the working people and for struggle to overcome survivals of the past in the minds of people. The importance of the party, and its moral and political authority and influence in society always directly depend on the

theoretical, political and organisational level of the party itself, on the cohesion of its ranks and their ideological maturity, on the ability of party organisations to exercise their leading role in practice, on the energy and efficiency of every Communist.

The Communist party is the political leader, political organiser and political teacher of the working people. Only the party, which expresses the vital interests of all classes and strata of the population and seeks to combine them harmoniously, can unite all the people, guide their conscious activities, eliminate alien phenomena and trends, create opportunities for realising the socialist principles in all social fields, and ensure the observance of socialist principles of organisation and planning in all fields of socialist construction. The leading role is not assigned to the party once and for all irrespective of its independent efforts; the party is conscious that it must win and consolidate this role by its selfless activities in the interests of the people.

The importance of consolidating the leading role of Marxist-Leninist parties in the socialist countries was reaffirmed at the International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties in Moscow in 1969. The Meeting noted that "the Communist party is the vanguard of socialist society as a whole", and that "the utilisation of the tremendous possibilities opened up by the new system depends on the Communist parties in the leadership of the state, on their ability to resolve the problems of socialist development the Marxist-Leninist way."¹

The revisionists deny the necessity for the lead-

¹ *International Meeting*, p. 22.

ing role of the Communist party as a law of social development confirmed by the experience gained in socialist construction in the Soviet Union and other socialist countries; they would like to reduce the party's functions in socialist society to education. They hold that the party should be regarded simply as a mass organisation no different from other mass political, trade-union and cultural organisations, which acts, not as leader, but as an "equal partner". They accordingly advocate a multi-party system like the multi-party system in bourgeois society, with opposition parties struggling for power.

Communists do not exclude the possibility of a multi-party system in socialist countries if such a system conforms to their traditions and historical conditions; they regard it as a political expression of an alliance and cooperation between various strata of the working people under the leadership of the working class. Communists therefore regard the multi-party system not as a negation, but as acceptance of the leading role of the working class and its vanguard, as a system which has nothing in common with bourgeois pluralism. Communist parties invariably stress in their policy statements that the party's ability to play the leading role in the fight for socialism is indispensable to the building of socialism. During the transition to socialism as well as under socialism, the existence of a one-party or a multi-party system is for Communists not an abstract principle, but depends on specific conditions, including the policies pursued in socialist construction by non-communist parties that are allied with the Communists.

Communists cannot reconcile themselves to the activity of forces hostile to socialism. Democratic parties favouring socialism are in duty bound to

defend the new social system against hostile intrigues. "The Socialist power of the working people and their allies," the French Communist Party stressed in its Manifesto of 1968, "will bring the full weight of the law to bear upon persons and organisations violating the new legality and undertaking actions directed against socialism and democracy."¹

The events in Czechoslovakia in 1968 showed that attempts to deviate from the Marxist-Leninist position with regard to the leading role of the Communist party, and from Leninist organisational principles, can have grave consequences. The Right-opportunist and anti-socialist forces directed their main blow at the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia. They sought to cast doubt on the Party's political and moral right to guide socialist society, and contended that there was no need for the Party to guide socialist construction, since society would supposedly reach communism as a result of the operation of an immutable law of social development. Anti-socialist, Right-opportunist elements propagated the theory of "pluralistic" democracy and called for a "partnership" between essentially different kinds of political parties, for the "free play of forces" and for the establishment of opposition parties, i.e., they advocated a model of bourgeois-democratic society. Right-wing elements in the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia sought to undermine the Party ideologically and organisationally. They proposed to introduce the principle of "autonomy" of the Party organisations, according to which

¹ *Pour une démocratie avancée, pour une France socialiste! Manifeste du Parti communiste français* in *Cahiers du communisme*, 1969, N. 1, p. 138.

the Party was to be an "association" whose units would not be cemented by a unity of organisational principles, discipline or the Marxist-Leninist ideological platform.

The activities of the Right revisionists caused a profound crisis in the Communist Party and Czechoslovak society as a whole, and there arose the danger of loss of the socialist gains of the Czechoslovak people. This clearly exposed once more the real nature of revisionism, which hides behind hypocritical phrases about "democratic" and "humane" socialism, and its profound hostility towards the cause of the revolutionary working class and the interests of real and not artificially "modelled" socialism.

The Communist Party of Czechoslovakia succeeded in overcoming the crisis because the forces loyal to Marxism-Leninism, to the principles of proletarian internationalism, won the struggle against the Right-wing, anti-socialist forces. The 14th Party Congress, held in May 1971, pointed out in its resolution: "The Communist Party of Czechoslovakia is again capable of exercising its leading role in all spheres; it is the ideological, political and guiding centre of society. It guarantees the indissoluble unity of our efforts in building the new society with the international activity of the community of socialist countries, with the Soviet Union and the revolutionary struggle of the international Communist and anti-imperialist movement. In the struggle against Right opportunism and revisionism the Party has restored its revolutionary forces, it is ideologically united and strong and is again advancing along the Leninist road, setting bold and complex tasks."

The revisionists attempt by every possible means not merely to undermine the leading role

of the Communist parties in the revolutionary movement and in the construction of the new society, but to destroy the parties by disrupting them ideologically and organisationally.

The revisionists are trying to shake the unity of the Communist parties by attacking their theoretical basis, dialectical materialism, which is a component part of Marxism. In attacking the French Communist Party and with it the Communist movement as a whole, Garaudy writes: "If the Party wishes to be more than a doctrinaire set, if it wishes to be leaven for all the forces which, in France, are desirous of building socialism, it cannot afford to have an 'official philosophy' nor can it be in principle either idealist, materialist, religious or atheist."¹ He denounces the "mechanical" connection between a philosophical ideology and political action, which he alleges, exists in the Communist parties.

In his "L'Alternative" Garaudy takes one more step along this road and openly advocates religious obscurantism. Faith, he claims, is "not an opiate but a ferment in remaking the world". On this ground he calls for "Christianising" Marxism-Leninism, for "integrating" in it "Christian power", "the divine moving spirit of man".² Garaudy's appeal to the Communist parties to renounce the materialist philosophy, the foundation of the proletarian outlook, testifies to his striving to deprive the vanguard of the working class of its tested ideological and theoretical weapon.

Today, when the ideological confrontation between socialism and capitalism is intensifying, it is particularly important for Communists to up-

¹ *The Turning-Point of Socialism*, p. 230.

² *L'Alternative*, pp. 114, 119.

hold the fundamental propositions of their theory and to fight for the purity and consistency of their class position. The propaganda mills of the bourgeoisie, which have enormous material resources at their disposal, continue to exert a strong influence on millions of people in the capitalist world. The bourgeoisie has elevated anti-communism, its main weapon, to the level of government policy. Therefore, any deviation from the proletarian ideology, whether it be in the form of concessions to idealism which, as Lenin said, continues to turn "the slightest vacillation in philosophical thought to its own advantage",¹ or in any other form, objectively strengthens the position of the bourgeois ideology and amounts virtually to renunciation of an independent proletarian policy. This is why Communist parties cannot abandon their militant materialist stand and be neutral in the confrontation between the antagonistic ideologies.

Garaudy not only deviates from materialism as a result of his ideological instability. His is an act of open betrayal of the revolutionary cause. This is particularly evident from a comparison of his present statements with those he made on the 40th anniversary of the publication of Lenin's "Materialism and Empirio-Criticism". At that time Garaudy wrote: "Any compromise on the question of materialism weakens the class struggle of the proletariat. Dialectical materialism is the only revolutionary philosophy. It is based unreservedly on reality, and it is the only philosophy which enables us to understand and transform it. All other philosophies act as a brake. Any deviation from materialism is therefore the ideological ex-

¹ Lenin, *Coll. Works*, Vol. 14, p. 358.

pression of distrust in the working class.”¹ But this is the very deviation he has made, thus betraying the revolutionary cause.

As historical experience shows, it is precisely the Communists who have been able at every stage relying on Marxist-Leninist theory, to give a truly scientific analysis of the epoch in which we live, and of capitalist society, the main trends of its development and the role of the various classes and strata, and to work out the strategy and tactics of the revolutionary struggle of the working class. Thanks to this they have been able to make, and continue to make now, the decisive contribution to the revolutionary transformation of the world. Communist parties have led socialist revolutions to victory in one-third of the world. Thanks to the purposeful activity of the Communists socialism is becoming the decisive factor in world development. In recent years, the workers' parties have played an exceptionally important part in the attack mounted by the working people, headed by the working class, on the state-monopoly system in the capitalist world. Ever greater interest is being shown in Marxism-Leninism and the theoretical and organisational principles of the Communist parties in the developing countries, among the participants in the national-liberation movement. Lenin constantly stressed the importance of revolutionary theory to the working-class struggle, and pointed out that if it was to win the struggle the party must carry on its activities on the basis of a scientific world outlook.

The revisionists violently attack the organisational principles of the Marxist-Leninist parties.

¹ *Cahiers du communisme*, 1949, N. 4, p. 469.

They try to undermine their organisational unity, oppose democratic centralism as the basic principle of their organisation, and advocate the rejection of party discipline. They try every possible means to turn the Communist party from being a militant class party, a party of the people and a party of action, into a debating society incapable of effective revolutionary action against the capitalist system.

In their attack on the organisational basis of the Communist parties, the revisionists above all deny the international character of the Leninist organisational principles. They present these principles, which stem from the very nature of the Communist party as a party of revolutionary action, as the product of specifically Russian conditions and of the circumstances of the political struggle at the beginning of the 20th century. Fischer writes: "Lenin's party conformed to specific historical and social conditions. Now new organisational forms and principles are needed."¹ Garaudy calls for the transformation of "the very conception of the party and its organisation", and demands that a model be created for a Communist party in an economically and technically advanced country which has an educated working class.²

Thus the revisionists, deliberately obscuring the essence of the matter, try to replace the question of the principles of the organisation of Communist parties with the question of the concrete forms of their organisation. This is done with the object of making it easier to accuse Communist parties of failure to conform to present-day conditions.

¹ Ernst Fischer, *Erinnerungen und Reflexionen*, S. 349.

² *The Turning-Point of Socialism*, p. 222.

The revisionists reduce Lenin's principles of the party's organisational structure to a specific organisational form which was characteristic of the Bolshevik Party at a certain stage and under certain conditions. They allege that Lenin established once and for all an organisational party structure and regarded it as immutable, and that in their organisational forms present-day Marxist-Leninist parties are no different from the Bolshevik Party when it was illegal. Garaudy declares outright that in establishing the Third International Lenin intended to make the proletariat of other countries "copy the forms of its organisation from the organisational forms of the Bolshevik Party, which remained for a long time underground and won thanks to armed struggle."¹

But it was Lenin who stated that parties working in different conditions—for instance, legal, semi-legal and illegal parties—must have different structures. The organisational forms of a party depend on the specific conditions under which it operates. Lenin stressed that "It would... be highly erroneous to apply... experience blindly, imitatively and uncritically to *other* conditions and *other* situations."² The main thing is to observe the basic principles of party organisation which are of international, universal importance, such as democratic centralism, individual selection and a class approach when admitting new members, collectivity in work, ideological and organisational unity, strict discipline binding on all Communists, inner-party democracy, guidance of the mass organisations of the working people and, after the party's advent to power,

¹ *L'Alternative*, p. 204.

² Lenin, *Coll. Works*, Vol. 31, p. 35.

guidance of all economic, state and cultural development.

Such was the line of action of the Comintern, which strove to affirm Lenin's ideological and organisational principles in the activity of every contingent of the Communist movement in view of their universal validity, since this accorded with the interests of the working-class movement in every country and was dictated by historical necessity, by the action of the general laws of social development and class struggle. The Comintern made wide use of the experience of Lenin's Party, the first party which had brought victory to the working class of its country, but at the same time it stressed the need for the young Communist parties not to copy mechanically everything from the Bolshevik Party, but to borrow from Russian Bolshevism that which was international, universal.

The Leninist organisational principles are the source of the vitality and efficiency of the Communist and workers' parties. Relying on these principles, the Communist movement has become what it is today—the most influential political force of our epoch.

The international significance of the Leninist organisational principles and the need for the Marxist-Leninist parties to observe them if they are to succeed in their work have been pointed out repeatedly by fraternal parties and in statements by their leaders. In its statement "On the Lenin Centenary" the National Committee of the Communist Party of the United States of America stressed that American Communists had always built their party on the lines indicated by Lenin. Upholding the Leninist principles, they had often had to fight against those who sought to liquidate

the party from "Left" and Right positions or to enfeeble it by abandoning the principle of democratic centralism. "Our experience," the statement said, "has driven home the lesson that only on Leninist principles can a revolutionary party of socialism be built. These principles are no less valid for our party and for all other Communist parties today than they were in the tsarist Russia of Lenin's day."¹

The revisionists attack the Communist parties not because the parties are "outdated", but because the revisionists themselves depart from Marxist-Leninist positions in assessing the nature and driving forces of the contemporary epoch; they believe that certain consequences of the scientific and technological revolution are of paramount importance to social development, and they belittle or even deny the key role played by the working class and its revolutionary struggle in the transformation of the world along socialist lines.

The necessary unity of form and content is embodied in the Leninist type of working-class party, whose organisational form fully accords with its revolutionary content. Lenin emphasised that a strong, centralised party conformed to Marxist theory and practice. The Leninist organisational principles are based on the principle of democratic centralism, which gives the party ideological and organisational unity. Democratic centralism helps set up an effective organisation in which discipline and organisational efficiency are coupled with a high level of democracy.

It should be stressed that the revisionists give a bourgeois interpretation of the concept of party

¹ *Political Affairs*, No. 2, 1970, p. 9.

democracy. To Communists, inner-party democracy means responsible participation of party members in discussing and deciding various questions, and in carrying out the decisions that have been adopted. This process is a characteristic feature of the Communist Party as a party of revolutionary action. In bourgeois parties "democracy" signifies at best the right to voice one's opinion and does not presuppose action to carry out decisions.

Consistent observance of the principle of democratic centralism enables the Marxist-Leninist party and its leadership to establish close ties with the people, with the working class. It ensures unity in the sphere of policy and in ideological work, solidarity between the leadership and rank-and-file activists, and makes it possible to use the people's experience and initiative on a wide scale, to direct the efforts of millions towards the attainment of their objective—the building of socialism and communism.

These are fundamentals of Marxism-Leninism and they form the basis of all party work. Fischer and Garaudy are well aware of this, for they were long-standing members of Communist parties and were elected to their leading bodies. But they deliberately deny partisanship and party discipline. To reject these essential features of Party organisation, Lenin said, is "tantamount to completely disarming the proletariat *in the interests of the bourgeoisie*." ¹

The revisionists attack democratic centralism with demagogic appeals for the development of "local initiative", for a "free exchange of views", etc. Garaudy calls for a "free circulation of ideas" among all party members, and says that for those

¹ Lenin, *Coll. Works*, Vol. 31, pp. 43-44.

members who have special aims of their own "it ought to be possible to institute open discussions about every fundamental problem and the best means of attaining the desired ends".¹ In other words, the party of like-minded persons with a common aim is replaced by a conglomerate of persons whose endless disputes prevent them from adopting decisions and taking action: a group refusing to accept the declared aims of another group can adopt a contrary stand, and the party disintegrates. In cases when the party adopts decisions binding on all, Garaudy proposes measures which would paralyse its ability to organise any activities and guide mass action. He says that not only vertical relations should be established in the party (from top to bottom and vice versa), but also horizontal ones, between all cells and other similar party units. This means that each of the 20,000 cells of the French Communist Party must establish contact with all other cells. But there would then be no time for working among the people.

Although Garaudy uses scientific-sounding phraseology when he discusses the "contemporary" Communist Party, it emerges clearly that his aim is to turn it into a shapeless association incapable of guiding revolutionary struggle. For it is precisely the organic synthesis of democracy and centralism inside the party that enables it and all party organisations to take political action, and stimulates Communists to take the initiative; at the same time it lends the party a cohesion and sense of purpose which are of vital importance for consistent work on specific problems. Communist parties, based as they are on democratic

¹ *The Turning-Point of Socialism*, p. 226.

centralism, do discuss important problems and do take account of their members' proposals. But when holding such discussions they keep in mind the principles advanced by Lenin, who said: "A theoretical discussion is one thing, and the Party's political line—a political struggle—is another. We are not a debating society. . . . Our first duty is to carry on the fight against great odds, and that needs unity."¹

The fate of various "Leftist" groupings (with which some revisionists openly sympathise) shows what these calls for unlimited "freedom of discussion" lead to in practice. These groupings have become nothing more than sects of incorrigible talkers, unable to organise mass action and isolated completely from the main contingents of the working people.

Exposing the revisionists' intentions, Waldeck Rochet, one of the leaders of the French Communist Party, said in 1969: "Today, Right and Left revisionists are concentrating their main attack on democratic centralism. Under the guise of fighting 'Party apparatuses' they are really reproaching the French Communist Party for being too well organised. They want to see us dis-united and divided into half a dozen factions, trends and groups. . ." He stressed that the Leninist organisational principles helped to unite the French Communists and gave them unity of will and action. "Non-observance of these principles, toleration of various trends and factions, which is demanded by some people, would quickly destroy Party unity. We would no longer have a truly proletarian party of the new type, as the most effective instrument of the working class and the

¹ Lenin, *Coll. Works*, Vol. 32, p. 252.

people; instead we would have a conglomerate of numerous discussion clubs that would be at loggerheads with one another. That is why we shall always see to it that the principles of democratic centralism are observed. . . Democratic centralism ensures broad democracy and creates conditions for the unity and efficiency of the Party.”¹ In Italy, too, opportunists tried to undermine the Party’s fighting strength by calling for the “freedom of factions”, hoping to turn the Party from an effective organisation into a discussion club. Luigi Longo, General Secretary of the Italian Communist Party, said at the 11th Congress of the Italian Communist Party: “We are not and do not intend to become a ‘party of opinions’, like any Social-Democratic party. Still less do we want to become a discussion club divorced from reality and carrying on no specific work.”

The revisionists employ all sorts of subterfuges in their attempts to undermine the Communist Party organisationally and divide it into various trends and groups. Lately they have been saying that the Communist parties in the capitalist countries must be the structural and organisational prototype of the future socialist society (according to the revisionist “model”, of course). Garaudy, for instance, has said that even under capitalism “something should be done to make the French Communist Party appear, by its internal functioning and also by the perspectives it opens up, as the prototype of socialist democracy”.² In essence, he says that the French Communist Party must become a prototype of the multi-party system. He believes that only then the “proposition

¹ *L'Humanité*, 25 février, 1969.

² *The Turning-Point of Socialism*, p. 229.

that it is possible to build socialism with a plurality of parties, groups and social organisations, can acquire a concrete meaning for millions of people in France".¹

Garaudy thus ignores the Marxist-Leninist proposition that in capitalist society the Communist Party must be organised in such a way as to enable it to carry out its main task, which is to organise and guide the struggle of the working class for the revolutionary transformation of society.

A hundred years ago, Engels scathingly criticised the Bakuninists, who had attacked the organisational principles of the First International. They had maintained that, as the "nucleus of the future human society", it must be an expression of their principles of "freedom and federalism", and called for the rejection of everything that "leads to authority and dictatorship".² He showed that they were thus virtually calling for the rejection of the organisation of the proletariat "in accordance with the requirements of the struggle it is daily and hourly compelled to wage",³ that they were in effect advocating a refusal to observe party discipline and the rule of the submission of the minority to the majority, a refusal to abide by decisions and to adhere to the other organisational principles of a militant, revolutionary party. Engels said that if the logic of the Bakuninists were to be followed one would have to rack one's brains trying to determine whether every clause of the Party Rules and every con-

¹ *The Turning-Point of Socialism*, p 230.

² K. Marx, F. Engels, V. Lenin, *Anarchism and Anarcho-Syndicalism*, Moscow, 1972, p. 62.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 63.

gress resolution conformed to the anarchists' nebulous ideas of the future society, and there would be no time left for waging a struggle against governments and the bourgeoisie. "Indeed," he said, there would be "no party discipline, no centralisation of forces at a particular point, no weapons of struggle!"¹

Garaudy's concept has been criticised by leaders of fraternal parties as being both harmful and theoretically untenable. At the 19th Congress of the French Communist Party, Etienne Fajon, a French Communist Party leader, said of Garaudy's platform: "The multi-party system in no way makes it incumbent on any party to renounce its organisational principles. To demand for the sake of modernisation or cybernetics that the internal life of the party of the working class should be the prototype of democracy based on pluralism would be to replace the Leninist type of organisation, united on a principled basis, with an old type of Social-Democratic organisation having a mosaic of trends, an organisation whose bankruptcy was revealed by the First World War 55 years ago. In short, we are offered, as an organisation conforming to the requirements of the day, a party torn apart by endless discussions, deprived of proletarian leadership and divided into feuding groups."²

Similar criticism of the views of the revisionists is expressed in the documents of the 12th Congress of the Italian Communist Party. Luigi Longo observed: "Our Party is a component of society and a militant force, but it cannot become a prototype

¹ K. Marx, F. Engels, V. Lenin, *Anarchism and Anarcho-Syndicalism*, M., 1972, p. 63.

² *Cahiers du communisme*, 1970, N. 2-3, pp. 216-17.

of the entire society; it cannot even potentially become a socialist state.”¹

While the revisionists call for inner-party democracy, their practical activities give them away. Garaudy, Fischer and others like them call for a “free exchange of ideas”, for “the initiative of all and everyone”, and so on, but actually they seek to establish “freedom of action” for themselves, for anti-party groups and factions, and the “initiative” they want is to be directed against the interests of the party. They gloss over the duties of party members, and call for “initiative from below” to attack the party’s leadership and policy, for anti-party activities, for starting a factional struggle, and for setting rank-and-file members against the party leadership.

The revisionists’ attempts to revise the Marxist-Leninist doctrine on the Party—whatever the form of these attempts and however “modern” the phraseology employed to disguise them—testify to a departure from proletarian class positions, to a betrayal of the cause of the working class not only of their own country but of the whole world. The international working-class and Communist movement is the first movement in history in which defence of the national interests of one’s own people is consistently combined with loyalty to proletarian internationalism. Proletarian internationalism, this most important feature of the ideology and policy of the working class and the Communist parties, is firmly founded on objective reality. It stems from the community of vital interests of the working people of all countries, ensuring their cohesion and unity of action in the

¹ *XII Congresso del Partito comunista italiano. Atti e risoluzioni*, Roma, Editori Riuniti, 1969, p. 80.

struggle for the revolutionary transformation of society. The struggle of different contingents of the working class for their interests under the leadership of Marxist-Leninist parties assumes the character of a single stream of revolutionary struggle against the internationally united class enemy, capitalism and imperialism, against the entire system of exploitation and social and national oppression.

Communism is incompatible with nationalism and chauvinism. As they grapple with the essentially international tasks of the struggle against capitalism, Communist parties understand that the success of the activity of every party in its own country depends on the results of the world struggle taking place between socialism and capitalism. Therefore they see it as their prime duty to contribute in every way to changing the correlation of world forces in favour of socialism, specifically by working to rally and consolidate the forces of socialism both in their own country and throughout the world. In this is manifested the unity of the national and international tasks of the Marxist-Leninist parties.

Every Communist Party, being as it is a contingent of the world army of Communists, makes its own contribution to the theory and practice of party building. Every success in a party's political work, in the ideological and organisational strengthening of its ranks, in extending its influence, and in socialist and communist construction, strengthens the belief of the people at large in the correctness of the ideas of scientific communism and induces them to give the Communist movement their active support.

The revisionists' attacks on contingents of the Communist movement in different countries and

especially on socialist countries and their Marxist-Leninist parties are harmful to the world working-class and Communist movement as a whole, whose unity and cohesion the revisionists hope to undermine. The revisionists in fact join the imperialist enemy in its anti-communist campaign. In the worldwide confrontation of the two social systems they objectively align themselves with the supporters of capitalism, imperialism and the exploitative system. It is little wonder that their views are given such wide currency by the mass media of the capitalist world in order to attack the Communist parties, and in an attempt to discredit the party leadership and misrepresent Marxism-Leninism. We have seen borne out again and again the correctness of Lenin's words that "working-class activists who follow the opportunist trend are better defenders of the bourgeoisie than the bourgeois themselves".¹

An unremitting struggle must be waged against the disruptive activities carried on by the revisionists of all types and against their efforts to distort both the Leninist principles of party organisation and the role of the Marxist-Leninist parties in social development. This struggle is an important factor in building the ideological, political and organisational unity of Communist and workers' parties and consolidating their ranks on the principled basis of Marxism-Leninism, and in ensuring the continued onward successful march of the international Communist movement.

¹ Lenin, *Coll. Works*, Vol. 31, p. 231.

Conclusion

The "theories" advanced by the revisionists are of a Right-opportunist and petty-bourgeois nature. Methodologically they are characterised by eclecticism, by a move away from materialism to idealism, and by the replacement of dialectics with metaphysics. The revisionists present a distorted, one-sided interpretation of present-day events, and are quite incapable of analysing and explaining correctly the deep-going social processes now taking place, in all their variety, interconnection and development.

But their views represent a danger to the revolutionary forces, the working class and the Marxist-Leninist parties. First of all, posing as followers of Marx, Engels and Lenin, the revisionists seek to capitalise on the wide popularity of the Marxist-Leninist ideas. They falsify the revolutionary teaching of the proletariat, passing off their opportunist and reformist ideas as Marxism. It is no accident that their ideas and concepts, embroidered with "Marxist" phraseology and talk about changed historical conditions, gain a certain currency among those not very well versed in the ideological and political fields. Second, the revisionists accuse the Marxist-Leninist parties of being

"dogmatic". They pose as "renovators" of Marxism, and claim that they are creatively developing the revolutionary theory. This often confuses unstable elements in the Communist parties. Third, monopoly capitalism give the concepts of the revisionists wide and constant publicity, thereby influencing some of the working people.

The revisionists adopt a position utterly at variance with Marxist theory and reality by belittling or ignoring the key role of the working class in the revolutionary movement, and by their virtual denial of the historical mission of the proletariat. They cite the social changes brought about by the scientific and technological revolution as justification for reducing the revolutionary role and potential of the proletariat and exaggerating the importance of other strata, especially the intelligentsia, and the students. The revisionists try to "dissolve" the working class away in other classes and strata, and to replace it with the intelligentsia, which they give the leading role in society. This amounts to an attempt to render the revolutionary movement without effective leadership and throw its ranks into disarray, thus objectively helping monopoly capitalism to strengthen its position.

Equally great harm is being done to the development of the world revolutionary process by the revisionists' campaign against the countries which already have socialism, and especially the Soviet Union. The revisionists ignore the tremendous achievements of the socialist countries in economic, scientific and cultural development, in the dramatic raising of living standards, and in the development of socialist democracy. Instead, they harp on the difficulties of revolutionary development and the mistakes made and temporary pro-

blems encountered in some socialist countries, and seek to set these countries against each other. The efforts of the renegades today are directed towards slandering the real socialism that exists, in an attempt to discredit it in the eyes of the working people and to oppose to it revisionist "models of socialism", to distract the people from the revolutionary struggle against capitalism for the building of genuine socialism. Their concepts are all the more dangerous because they are advanced by people who claim to be "Marxists" and "Communists".

The revisionists direct their main blow against the Communist and workers' parties—the vanguard revolutionary force of modern times, which unites the struggle of the working class for socialism and the general democratic, anti-imperialist movements into a single revolutionary front. Not infrequently the revisionists operate within Communist parties as "Trojan Horse" of monopoly capital. Their subversive, disruptive activities have only one aim—to weaken the effectiveness of the Communist parties, to undermine their unity and cohesion, to prevent them from leading the working people.

The revisionists are working to undermine the ideological, political and organisational unity of the Communist parties and the working-class movement. Revisionism acts to paralyse the revolutionary will of the working class and disarm it in its struggle against the oppression of capital. The position of the revisionists from both Right and "Left" becomes more and more closely bound up with nationalism. The attempts of the revisionists to break up the international Communist and working-class movement and to weaken the internationalist ties between fraternal parties tend to

disorient some fighters against imperialism and render more difficult the establishment and consolidation of a broad anti-imperialist front. An uncompromising struggle against revisionism is therefore necessary in order to strengthen the unity of the world Communist and working-class movement.

It is becoming more and more obvious that Right and "Left" opportunists are uniting on a common platform of denial of the leading role of the proletariat in the anti-imperialist movement, hostility toward the Communist parties, and rabid anti-Sovietism and nationalism. It is therefore of paramount importance to combat opportunism. Marxist-Leninists regard it as their duty to expose the opportunist views of the would-be wreckers of the Party and to further develop the Marxist-Leninist theory. The Communist and workers' parties are taking political and organisational measures to prevent the renegades from carrying on their disruptive activities, condemning their anti-party operations and expelling them from the party.

Revisionism must be exposed in theory and practice. Its opportunist practitioners must be condemned and dealt with resolutely in the interests of the unity of the international Communist and working-class movement and all revolutionary forces engaged in the struggle against imperialism for the final victory of socialism.

НАУЧНЫЙ КОММУНИЗМ И ЕГО ФАЛЬСИФИКАТОРЫ
на английском языке

Цена 56 коп.

